FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-205
Tuesday
23 October 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-205 CONTENTS *23 October 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Karpov Explains Proposal for Nuclear-Free Baltic *[TASS]* 1
- Zorin Questions Current Viability of SDI Program *[Moscow International]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- TASS Reports Ignatenko's 22 Oct Briefing 3
  - Terms Primakov Talks 'Very Useful' 3
  - Details Gorbachev Visit to Spain 3
  - Previews Joint Spanish Documents 3
- Solton Comments on Primakov's Mission *[Moscow International]* 3
- PRAVDA Explains Soviet Position on Gulf Crisis *[21 Oct]* 4
- Zagladin Cited on Rimini Forum Discussion of Gulf *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 5
- NATO Exercises in North Atlantic 'Sow Confusion' *[Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 17 Oct]* 5
- World Labor Organization To Set Up Soviet Center *[TRUD 9 Oct]* 6
- Gorbachev Sends Message to Global Forum on Family *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 7
- Bovin Views Ties With Korea, China, Japan *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 7
- 'International Observers Roundtable' Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Further Reportage on Cheney's Moscow Visit 15
  - Holds News Conference With Yazov *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 15
  - Discusses Military 'Openness' *[Moscow International]* 16
  - Sees Positive Results *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Oct]* 16

Northeast Asia

- Deputy Electronics Minister Speaks on ROK Ties *[Moscow International]* 17
- ROK-Backed Timber Project Starts in Svetlyy Bay *[Moscow TV]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- U.S.-Philippines November Base Talks Viewed *[Moscow International]* 18
- Researcher's Book on Philippines Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 19

Near East & South Asia

- Reports Continue on Persian Gulf Crisis 20
  - Heath's Visit to Iraq Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 20
  - Kuwaiti Envoy's Assessments Noted *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 20
  - Peace Organizations Issue Appeal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Oct]* 21
- Iraqi 'Anxiety' Over Soviet-U.S. Ties Noted *[Moscow TV]* 21
- Returnees From Iraq Describe Conditions *[TRUD 14 Oct]* 22
- Fallout From Jerusalem Killings Continues 23
  - Arab League Council Meets *[Moscow International]* 23
  - Links With Gulf Crisis Noted *[TRUD 14 Oct]* 24
  - 'Wave of Terror' Seen *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 24

  - PLO's Al-'Abbas Interviewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 42]* 25
  - PLO Advisor Comments *[Moscow Radio]* 27
  - U.S., Israeli 'Antagonism' Seen *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 27
- Exchange of Ministers With Iran Fosters Ties *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 28
- Nishanov Praises Relations With India *[TASS]* 29
- Drop in Oil Prices Curtails Trade With Morocco *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 29

East Europe

- Last Soviet Helicopter Regiment Leaves CSFR *[Moscow TV]* 30
- Yakovlev Addresses Forum on East Europe *[TASS]* 30
- Lukyanov Meets Bulgarian Assembly Leader *[Moscow TV]* 32
- Central Committee's Vlasov Visits Bulgaria *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 32

West Europe

- Shevardnadze Interviewed on Vienna Talks *[Moscow TV]* 33
- Reports Continue on Luxembourg Premier's Visit 34
  - Talks With Gorbachev Viewed *[TASS]* 34
  - Ryzhkov Makes Dinner Speech *[TASS]* 34
  - Culture Minister Notes Agreement *[TASS]* 35
- Moiseyev To Visit Belgium, NATO Headquarters *[TASS]* 35
- Sitaryan, European Community Leaders Meet *[TASS]* 35
- Soviet Science Festival Opens in Austria 36
  - Ryzhkov Sends Message *[TASS]* 36
  - Scientists Present Technology *[Vienna TV]* 36
- TASS Interviews Cypriot President on Ties 36
- Gorbachev Congratulates Cypriot Party Chairman *[TASS]* 37
- Gorbachev Names New Envoy to Cyprus *[TASS]* 37
- Protocol With Turkish Foreign Aides Signed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]* 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviets

- Measures To Counter Speculation Approved 22 Oct *[TASS]* 39
- Trushin Addresses Deputies on Speculation *[Moscow TV]* 39
- Supreme Soviet Discusses Rail Transport Bill *[TASS]* 39
- Debates on Speculation, Railroads Outlined *[Moscow TV]* 40
- Supreme Soviet Issues Foreign Affairs Resolution *[TASS]* 41
- PRAVDA Cites Deputies' Reaction to Economic Plan *[20 Oct]* 41
- Deputies' Remarks During Economic Debate Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Oct]* 42
- Further Details on Academics' News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 43
- Committee Discussions on Economic Plan Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* 44
- Privileges Commission Chairman Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 45

Political & Social

- Soviet Trade Unions Congress Opens 23 Oct 47
  - Gorbachev Attends Congress *[TASS]* 47
  - Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Elected to Presidium *[Moscow Radio]* 47
  - Ryzhkov Discusses Trade Unions *[Moscow Radio]* 48
- Gorbachev Greets All-Union Miners Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 49
- Need for Gorbachev-Yeltsin Cooperation Stressed *[Moscow International]* 49
- RSFSR Brings Criminal Charges Against Ligachev *[Moscow TV]* 49
- Editor Responds to Coup d'Etat Story *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 6 Oct]* 50
- Ministers, KGB Chief on Strengthening Order *[TASS]* 52
  - KGB on Criminal Damage *[TASS]* 52
  - Criminals 'Acquiring Power' *[TASS]* 53
- KGB Representatives Answer Officer's Allegations *[Moscow TV]* 54
- KGB Officer Discusses Organization *[Moscow TV]* 54

KGB Questions DIE ZEIT Reporter *[Hamburg DIE ZEIT 19 Oct]* 56
Youth Paper Interviews Kalugin *[Kishinev MOLODEZH MOLDAVII 11 Sep]* 56
Revival of Stalinist Tendencies Seen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* 59
Minister Reports Rail Strikes Called Off *[GUDOK 16 Oct]* 61
    Rail Transport Decree Highlighted *[GUDOK 13 Oct]* 61
Trains on Moscow-Leningrad Line Collide *[GUDOK 16 Oct]* 62
MOSCOW NEWS on PRAVDA Editors' 'Mutiny' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 41]* 62
New Prices for Newspaper Announced *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 63
Continuing Media Censorship Reported *[IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]* 63
Communists Ask End to 'Mockery' of Lenin *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Oct]* 66

Economic

PRAVDA Commentary on Economic Guidelines *[19 Oct]* 66
Low Standards Said To Worsen Economy *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 68
Moscow City Council To Introduce Food Rationing *[Moscow International]* 69
Goods Shortages, Production Problems Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Oct]* 69
Half of Goods Reportedly Go to Profiteers *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Sep]* 71
Reports Note Reactions to Russian Bank Reforms 73
    Overcentralization Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Oct]* 73
    May Cause 'Complete Chaos' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 74
    Paper Seeks To Dispel Fears *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* 75
Kirgizian Regional Economic Agreements End *[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]* 75
Regional Gas Supply Redistribution Planned *[Moscow TV]* 76
Port City Plans for Free Enterprise Zone *[Moscow TV]* 76
Lack of Funds Halts Rebuilding of Power Station *[Moscow TV]* 76
Aircraft Engines Dumped in Smolensk *[Moscow TV]* 77
Freightcar Blockade Delays Fertilizer Exports *[Moscow TV]* 77

Scientific

Cosmonaut's Ill Health Delays Spacewalk *[Moscow TV]* 77
Nuclear Stations Resist Outside Supervision *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 78
New Hovercraft Begins Service on Lake Baykal *[Moscow TV]* 79

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis 'Surprised' by Ryzhkov's Comment *[Budapest Radio]* 80
Prunskiene Claims Moscow Toughens Stand on Talks *[TASS]* 80
Prunskiene Examines Gorbachev's 'Obligation' *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 12 Oct]* 80
Prunskiene Discussions With Matlock Detailed *[EKHO LITVY 21 Sep]* 81
Prunskiene Briefs U.S. Reporters 20 Sep *[EKHO LITVY 21 Sep]* 82
Ozolas Discusses Negotiations With Moscow *[TASS]* 83
Kuzmickas Examines Negotiations With Moscow *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
Lithuania To Establish Economic Border Control *[Moscow Radio]* 85
Independence Party Wants Communists Disbanded *[Vilnius International]* 85
Lithuania Approves Privatization Laws, Statutes *[Vilnius Radio]* 85
Lithuania's Sajudis Deputies Hold Congress *[EKHO LITVY 25 Sep]* 85
Lithuania's Minorities Issues Examined *[EKHO LITVY 22 Sep]* 86
100 'Beaten Up' in Clash Over Latvia Monument *[Moscow TV]* 87
'Black Berets' Reject Order To Depoliticize *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 87
Court Case Against Journalist Opens in Latvia *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* 88
Estonia's Economic Border Law Detailed *[TASS]* 88
21 Oct Session of Estonian Supreme Soviet Reported *[Tallinn Radio]* 88

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 89
    22 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 89

  - Ovcharov, Yugin Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 89
  - Poltoranin Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 90
  - 23 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow Radio]* ... 91
- Deputies Deny Writing Yeltsin's Speech for Him *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Oct]* ... 91
- RSFSR Politburo Calls for 7 Nov Celebration *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Oct]* ... 91
- Special People's Deputies Session Requested *[TASS]* ... 92
- Deputy Interviewed on Draft of New Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Oct]* ... 92
- Coverage of 'Democratic Russia' Founding Congress ... 94
  - Proceedings Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* ... 94
  - Decisions Reported *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* ... 95
  - RSFSR Communist Party Statement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Oct]* ... 95
- Presidium Approves Use of Food Coupons in Moscow *[Moscow Radio]* ... 95
- Coverage of Moscow City Party Committee Plenum ... 96
  - Prokofyev Addresses Plenum *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ... 96
  - Resolution Outlining Tasks Passed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ... 104
- Broken Contracts Aggravate Leningrad Food Problems *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Oct]* ... 105
- Leningrad Communist Press Distribution Criticized *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* ... 106
- Leningrad Soviet Attempt To Curb Media Protested *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* ... 106
- Irkutsk Holds Russia Federation Party Conference *[Moscow Radio]* ... 107
- Mari Autonomous Republic Declares Sovereignty *[TASS]* ... 107

Western Republics

- Kebich Discusses Transfer to Market Economy *[Moscow Radio]* ... 107
- Belorussian Supreme Soviet Debates Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* ... 108
- Snegur Appeals to Gagauz To Prevent 'Tragedy' *[TASS]* ... 108
- Moldavian Officials Discuss Situation in Republic *[Moscow International]* ... 109
- Dnestr, Gagauz Republic Election Dates Set *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* ... 110
- Lvov 7 Nov Celebrations To Be Played Down *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct]* ... 110
- Kharkov Soviet Deems 7 Nov Event 'Inadvisable' *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* ... 110
- Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty Negotiations *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 11 Sep]* ... 110
- Ukrainian Orthodox Church Seeks Broader Autonomy *[TASS]* ... 115

Caucasus

- Georgian Legislative Election Preparations Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* ... 115
  - Communist Party Leads in Poll *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* ... 116
- Georgian National Congress Election Reported *[TASS]* ... 116
- Stonethrowers Attack Convoy in Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* ... 116
- Nakhichevan Power Cut Off for Fourth Time *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* ... 116
- International Business Congress Held in Azerbaijan *[TASS]* ... 117

Central Asia

- Kirghiz Soviet Discusses Osh Oblast Incidents *[Moscow TV]* ... 117
- Kirghizian Parliament Begins Extraordinary Session *[TASS]* ... 118
- Frunze City Soviet Decides To Hold 7 Nov Parade *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Oct]* ... 118
- Kirghiz Communist Party Plenum Examines Economy *[TASS]* ... 118
- Osh Deputies Oppose Creating Kirghiz Presidency *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* ... 118
- Kazakhstan To Have Public Ecological Newspaper *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ... 118

Karpov Explains Proposal for Nuclear-Free Baltic

LD2210174490 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Soviet Union issued a note last Thursday, addressed to the Baltic states, as well as the United States, Britain and France as nuclear powers, Soviet deputy foreign minister Viktor Karpov told a news conference here today.

The note proposes that these states begin talks on the Baltic's nuclear-free status.

Karpov pointed to a Soviet decision to stop installing nuclear weapons during peace on Soviet ships and warplanes in the Baltic and air space over it.

He noted that this step creates real conditions for giving the Baltic a nuclear-free status. He added that this move would be completed, even if other countries refuse to begin talks.

The USSR is sure of the need to step up efforts to make the Baltic nuclear-free, taking into account the great stabilising importance of Europe's north to the European process and the wish of peoples in this region to turn their countries into a reliable flank for a European and worldwide security system, Karpov continued.

However, he said, the efficient solution of problems connected with the Baltic's nuclear-free status is possible only through multilateral talks with the Baltic states, as well as nuclear powers using the sea.

In the run-up to such talks, it could be possible to hold consultations to study possible parameters of a future understanding, including control over its observance. In the opinion of the Soviet side, the complete withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from the Baltic should be the aim of future talks.

This could mean a ban on the placement of nuclear weapons on ships patrolling the Baltic and aircraft in air space over the sea, the complete prohibition of calls into the Baltic by ships with nuclear weapons on board from non-littoral states, non-emplacement of such weapons at sea, on the sea-bed or in the subsoil thereof.

It is important that the understanding on the Baltic's nuclear-free status should provide for firm guarantees of this status by nuclear powers using the Baltic and all littoral states, as well as for an effective control mechanism, Karpov stressed.

"We are sure that it is possible to make the Baltic nuclear-free if all interested countries actively participate in promoting this idea," he said.

Karpov emphasised that the Soviet initiative on the Baltic should be regarded in the broad context of other Soviet proposals, including the elimination of sea-based tactical nuclear weapons.

Representative of the Soviet General Staff Nikolay Markov, who participated in the news conference, said that there are Soviet nuclear [word indistinct] in the Baltic.

He pointed out that existing technical possibilities allow for monitoring the presence of nuclear weapons on warships and aircraft, even if they are "concealed" behind graphite of lead "jackets".

Appropriate experiments have already been carried out, Markov noted.

Zorin Questions Current Viability of SDI Program

LD2110103690 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 21 Oct 90

["Moscow Viewpoint" program prepared by Valentin Zorin; read by announcer]

[Text] The new man in charge of the SDI program, Henry Cooper, declared recently that the aims of the program would be altered considerably. According to Cooper, it will no longer be meant for protecting the country from a massive attack of thousands of ballistic missiles, but will meet much more modest purposes, protection from limited nuclear attacks. As we can see after each revision, the idea of the project becomes more and more detached from its original variant propsed by the then president Reagan in 1983. There is no talk today about the need to build a shield in outer space over the United States. Now the Pentagon plans to use land-based missiles instead of space weapons at the program's first stage.

To my mind all this serves to confirm that certain technical faults were discovered in the Star Wars program. When the realization of the program began reports appeared shortly afterward saying that the scientific aspects of the program were not substantiated and verified enough. It so happened that Ronald Reagan put more trust into the prestige of physicist Edward Teller, known in America as father of the H-bomb and also as the author of the SDI project, than into an objective scientific analysis. As the work on the project progressed more and more, reports appeared telling about its scientific and technical unsoundness. Three years ago a group of American experts discovered serious errors in Teller's calculations that made the project practically unfeasible, at least in the foreseeable future, and that happened when billions of dollars had already been spent on the realization of the program. The White House found it difficult to draw the necessary conclusions at the time, tell the American people the truth, and abandon the costly unrealistic idea.

But why is it that today too the current adminstration refuses to face the truth and give up the hopeless idea? Though the Pentagon's request for allocations has been cut down considerably by the Congress, billions will still be spent in the current fiscal year on the Star Wars plan, and this is despite the fact that technical considerations in favor of the cancellation of the program have been complemented now by political arguments as well.

We may recall at this point that the idea of the SDI program was put forward at the very height of the Cold War period, when the Soviet Union and the United States looked at each other as potential enemies. Military programs were drawn up with an eye to nuclear confrontation concepts. But now the situation has changed, why does the United States continue its work on the SDI program even in its changed form? We all know that today the Soviet Union and United Stats act more and more as partners on the international scene. It means that in these conditions the SDI program is just a waste of the American taxpayer's money. As for Soviet-American relations, it can only be a source of suspicion and mistrust, and I am convinced that this extremely costly, technically erroneous, and politically false project is not worth any spending.

TASS Reports Ignatenko's 22 Oct Briefing

Terms Primakov Talks 'Very Useful'

LD2210153290 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanischev]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Presidential press secretary Vitaliy Ignatenko today described as "very useful" talks held in a number of Western capitals last week by special presidential envoy Yevgeniy Primakov.

Ignatenko told a briefing that Primakov ended his mission, which involved searching for a political solution to the Gulf crisis, on Sunday afternoon.

"According to the opinion of our side, the talks in Rome, Paris, Washington, and London were all very useful," the press secretary said.

"Presidential Council member Yevgeniy Primakov repeated the Soviet leadership's known position of principle. Discussions concerned ways to implement United Nations resolutions and political measures to ensure that the conflict in the region ends without a war, without slaughter, without bloodshed.

"It was stressed that the resolution of the Gulf crisis should, in the final analysis, provide an important impetus to the tackling of other problems in the region."

"The Soviet leadership will always favour the quest for a peaceful outcome to the Gulf crisis," Ignatenko said.

He said that Primakov is now preparing "a detailed report for the president," which will be discussed on Tuesday in the presence of Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the heads of other interested agencies.

"Some measures will apparently be worked out to move faster, more confidently, and more precisely in this direction," Ignatenko said.

Details Gorbachev Visit to Spain

LD2210162990 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Konstantin Voitsekhovic and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Excerpt] Moscow October 22 TASS—[passage omitted] He [Ignatenko] noted that this first visit by a head of the Soviet state to Spain shows the USSR's sympathy for the Spanish people. It is a "recognition of the independent role played by Spain in the European process and international affairs."

Informing reporters about the visit's programme, Ignatenko said that Gorbachev would meet King Juan Carlos I and Queen Sofia one or two hours after his arrival in Madrid.

Later in the day, Gorbachev will meet Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez Marquez, and Soviet-Spanish talks at the level of foreign ministers will begin.

The Soviet president and his wife on Friday will visit Madrid municipality where he will be presented with a a symbolic key to the city.

On Friday evening Gorbachev will visit the Spanish parliament and deliver a speech.

He will continue talks with Gonzalez on Saturday, with the participation of the two foreign ministers. A ceremony conferring an honorary doctor's decree on Gorbachev at the Complutense University of Madrid will be held at midday.

The president will on Sunday depart for Barcelona, where he will make a sight-seeing tour of the city and meet members of the Spanish business community.

On Sunday evening Gorbachev is to depart for France, Ignatenko said.

Previews Joint Spanish Documents

LD2210142290 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Soviet Union and Spain will sign a "package of important documents" during President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Spain, which is to begin on October 26, Soviet president's assistant Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

Among the documents to be signed, he listed a joint Soviet-Spanish declaration, a protocol on Soviet-Spanish political consultations, a programme for scientific and technical cooperation over the next decade, agreements on cooperation in tourism, assistance in making and protecting investments, prevention of incidents on the high seas, control over illicit narcotics trafficking and a treaty on legal assistance in civil affairs and cooperation in cinema and television.

"All this gives grounds to believe that the visit will be truly historic and have a great impact on relations between the two nations," Ignatenko stressed.

Solton Comments on Primakov's Mission

LD2210144390 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] The Soviet President's special envoy, Yevgeniy Primakov, has held consultations with Western leaders about the situation in the Persian Gulf: he has visited Rome, Paris, Washington, and London.

Has any progress been made in moving toward a peaceful settlement of the crisis? Here is the view of our commentator, Yuriy Solton:

It is natural that, after visiting early this month the Gulf countries and having held a thorough discussion with the Iraqi president, Saddam Husayn, Yevgeniy Primakov went to these Western capitals not empty-handed. One can only make an educated guess about what concrete proposals he carried in his portfolio, but at least three conclusions can be made for certain:

First, Moscow is actively looking for ways of a political solution to the crisis. It insists on a peaceful, not military, solution in its dealing with the countries whose troops make up the backbone of the multinational force deployed in Saudi Arabia.

Secondly, a Soviet stand of principles has been reiterated, the stand that was formulated during the Helsinki summit between President Gorbachev and President Bush. The stand is this: Iraq must leave Kuwait, and that Arab state should regain sovereignty.

Thirdly, writes Yuriy Solton, I have paid attention to one phrase by Yevgeniy Primakov: Iraq will get no dividends from its aggression. I think such a statement refutes the option circulating of late about a possible partial settlement.

Another thing is clear: Even if Iraq has put forward such an option, the Soviet Union does not support it. By the way, last week an official statement was made in Moscow that the Iraqi leaders are profoundly deluded if they count on any special Soviet-Iraqi relations.

As I see it, continues Yuriy Solton, Yevgeniy Primakov's mission has shown that actually no one wants a Gulf war. It's a different matter whether it will be possible to avoid it. I believe that the United Nations is yet to have its final say. The Security Council sanctions against Iraq are effective, though in the past 2 and ½ months they have failed to strangle Baghdad, so to say. The atrocities by Israel on the occupied Palestinian lands have compelled some Arab countries to support Iraq. The moral and material responsibility of Iraq for the aggression against Kuwait was discussed last week in the United Nations Security Council. The issue is naturally important, but it might be more sensible to look for additional ways to force Iraq pull out from Kuwait and avoid war at the same time.

It cannot be ruled out that an important initiative on this score should be expected shortly.

PRAVDA Explains Soviet Position on Gulf Crisis

PM2210152090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Yu. Glukhov answer to readers' letter under the "Question-Answer" rubric: "Beyond Our Powers"; first three paragraphs are readers' letter]

[Text] "We ask you to explain in your newspaper a question that provoked an active discussion in our collective and that we did not manage to agree on. It concerns the blockade of Iraq, with whom we have a friendship treaty. Our leadership has complied with the United States' demand to establish a blockade of Iraq. Why then do we not demand a blockade of Israel, which is an aggressor on a much larger scale; why do we not send our ships to implement a blockade of Israel?

"The United States committed an aggression against Grenada and Panama. Why are we not calling for a blockade of the United States and why did we not break of relations with it like we do with aggressors?

"Maybe it is because it would be beyond our powers?"

[Signed] Workers from the Dzerzhinskiy Plant in Moscow V. Golubev, M. Semenov, S. Gavrilov"

Before we give a clear-cut answer as to whether confrontation with the United States is "beyond our powers," we must ask ourselves, what would it be for?

Iraq committed an act of aggression by swallowing up Kuwait. Baghdad is threatening to use chemical and bacteriological weapons. It has taken hostage foreign citizens, including Soviet specialists. Is it really necessary for us to get involved in the fight just to protect an aggressor and his actions, proceeding on the basis of treaty relations which Baghdad has violated anyway? I believe that this is not our war.

Furthermore, we do not just risk conflict with the United States. Many Arab countries—Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Morocco, and other states, have sent in military subunits against Iraq. Finally, the decision on a blockade of Iraq was unanimously adopted by the UN Security Council (and not the United States) and it is quite understandable that the Soviet Union has aligned itself with this and did not start placing itself in opposition to the international community.

We do not observe an analogous picture in the situations described in the letter. The Latin American countries did not even consider a military or sharp political confrontation with the United States during the events in Grenada or in Panama. Even among the Arabs there is no unified position as regards overcoming the consequences of the Israeli aggression. Egypt, for example, has restored diplomatic relations with Israel. Should the Soviet Union act unilaterally?

Moreover, encouraging aggression should not become a rule. And this is precisely the logic that operates in the letter, as far as Iraq is concerned. The opposite is true—an international mechanism for putting an end to aggression, if it can be developed and strengthened during the Kuwait-Iraq conflict, should be used to unblock other conflict situations.

Of course, in displaying heightened activeness in the Persian Gulf, the United States is also pursuing its own ends. But its position at the current stage coincides with the world community's position. Our arsenal does not include saber-rattling or getting drawn into the conflict, but seeking political means to solve it. And if we are going to rely on our powers, it should be our powers of wisdom.

Zagladin Cited on Rimini Forum Discussion of Gulf

PM1910141490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Own correspondent N. Miroshnik "Rimini Reportage": "Problems of the 'Eye of the Needle'"]

[Text] Rimini—The resort of Rimini is famous for its sandy beaches. But it is not to bathe in the autumnal Adriatic that people whose names are well-known in many countries come here each October. For several days each year the town's life seems to revolve around the Pio Manzu International Humanitarian Research Center, which has been holding its traditional international meetings here for 20 years now.

The Pio Manzu Center is a peripheral organization of the United Nations which coordinates and publicizes research in the sphere of geopolitical structures and the environment. The center's president is Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti. Its leading organs include political and public figures and prominent scientists from various countries, including the Soviet Union. As a nonprofit organization, the center enjoys support and cooperates with Italian Government institutions and also leading state and private financial and industrial groups.

There was a highly diverse agenda for this year's meeting which, as always, has an unusual name—the "Eye of the Needle." That Biblical symbol referred on this occasion to the Mediterranean region, where the destinies of Europe, Asia, and Africa have come together since time immemorial.

The participants in the discussion "Beyond the Final Wall: Lay Tolerance and Believers' Understanding," spent several hours debating topical political problems of the Near and Middle East. One of the participants, USSR presidential adviser V.V. Zagladin, who has visited Rimini before, gave your PRAVDA correspondent his impressions:

"In comparison even with last year's discussion there is a great difference. The title of our discussion mentions the 'final wall.' Which means, according to the organizers' idea, that the Berlin Wall has fallen and Europe has entered a new stage of development, but what about the rest of the world?

"The most diverse viewpoints have been expressed here, of course," V.V. Zagladin continued. "But I repeat, the important difference of the present discussions is that practically all the participants' speeches are influenced not just by detente but by the end of the cold war, too.

"As for the discussion on the conflicts in the Near East region, I have been impressed first by the fact that everyone is asking both themselves and others the question: Can the three conflicts—the Persian Gulf, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the Lebanese conflict—be settled individually or must they be resolved together? The very fact that the question is being asked indicates that the interconnection is coming to be understood. Yes, these are different conflicts with different origins but they are in the same region.

"It was interesting to hear how people view the pluses and minuses of the peaceful and nonpeaceful solutions. The first solution is attractive because it does not involve bloodshed, human casualties, or material damage. The negative aspect is first and foremost that it must inevitably be a compromise. Some say: It will seem that the aggressor has been rewarded. It is also worrying that a peaceful solution will leave Iraq with the army, powerful armaments, and weapons of mass destruction that it has now.

"But what is the logical conclusion therefore? A common security system must be created.

"The minuses of the military solution are obvious," my interlocutor continued, "the pluses are that this solution is radical. Even though here, too, approaches differ. Some talk about the need simply to punish the aggressor, to rebuff him, while others see the deeper cause of what is happening in the very character of the Iraqi regime. Here, too, there may be the most varied conclusions, but our position is well-known: Each country's regime is its internal affair. And, by the way, our Italian hosts and Cardinal P. Poupard, the Vatican representative, whose speech was constructive in character, proceed from the same premise.

"The third factor is the link between global and regional security. The Iraqi crisis has shown that there is no absolute dividing line between these concepts. That being so, despite all the goods things that we are doing in Europe we cannot forget any of the other regions. And the Europeans together with America both within the UN framework and elsewhere must help to create a common, universal security system with, perhaps, some regional subsystems but without separating one from the other...."

NATO Exercises in North Atlantic 'Sow Confusion'

PM1910104290 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 17 Oct 90 p 10

[Article by Aleksandr Yakovlev of IAN: "NATO Sows Confusion"]

[Text] The NATO "Teamwork-90" exercise held in the North Atlantic earlier this fall could be called a "performance without a leading role." Every time these exercises are held they turn into a gigantic demonstration of NATO's military strength and determination when it comes to carrying out attack operations in northern sea areas, including Soviet territorial waters.

However, unexpected changes affected NATO Command's plans: The U.S. participants in the exercise had gone to the Persian Gulf. But the scenario of the piece did not change much. It is the sluggishness of bloc thinking that has been at work. Ships, aircraft, and marine brigades from Britain, Germany, and a number of other NATO countries learn how to win control of the northern sea areas and to land marine troops there.

This type of military exercise has led to concern in the Soviet marine command. "Like it or not, we have to take obvious facts into consideration," Admiral Vasiliy Panin said. NATO views the Soviet Union as its main opponent. The scale of NATO's military exercises in waters within the Soviet Northern Fleet's area of responsibility confirms this. This year alone the number of military exercises in these areas has increased by 10-15 percent over the same period last year.

The Soviet Northern Fleet long ago adopted the principles in the new political thinking which seeks a defensive defense doctrine. According to a British periodical, the Soviet Union's naval activity in northern sea areas has decreased by 50 percent over the last five years. The scale of military exercises and the presence of ships from the Northern Fleet has also decreased in more distant areas.

Under such circumstances NATO forces' activities sow confusion. The fact that the "Teamwork-90" exercise went ahead even without its most important participant can give the impression that note has not been taken of the positive changes on the international scene and of the unilateral initiatives that have come from the Soviet Union's Armed Forces, including the Northern Fleet.

World Labor Organization To Set Up Soviet Center

91UF0037A Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by I. Belov: "ILO's Useful Experience"]

[Text] A meeting between V.P. Shcherbakov, deputy chairman of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], and Michel Hansenne, director general of the International Labor Office [byuro], was held on 6 October 1990 in the Palace of Labor. During the discussions, M. Hansenne was told about the problems that face USSR trade unions under conditions of the country's transition to a market economy, about the progress of preparations for the 19th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions, and about the tasks confronting them.

It was emphasized that the transition to a market economy requires increased cooperation between Soviet trade unions and the International Labor Organization [ILO] in the area of shaping labor and social legislation.

Information that the ILO will send a representative delegation to the 12th World Congress of Trade Unions was received with satisfaction.

The meeting took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and concerned dialogue.

Participating in the discussion were V.N. Makeyev, AUCCTU secretary, A.N. Zharikov, chief of the International Department of the AUCCTU, and other trade union officials.

* * *

On 8 October, M. Hansenne, director general of the International Labor Office, held a meeting in the news center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs with Soviet and foreign journalists. Opening the news conference, V.I. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Labor and Social Questions and chairman of the USSR Commission on ILO Affairs, noted that "the USSR proceeds from the fact that the activity of the ILO and its philosophy in this area have great significance for the resolution of all socio-economic problems under perestroyka conditions in the USSR." The ILO has gained tremendous experience on questions that are today very difficult for our country—social and labor questions. This predetermined the purpose of Mr. Hansenne's visit to Moscow. The director general of the International Labor Office was received by the president of the USSR. In the course of the conversation, M.S. Gorbachev rated very highly the significance of cooperation between the USSR and the ILO and its prospects.

Further, V.I. Shcherbakov reported that in the face of inevitable unemployment in the USSR in the transition to a market system of economic management, an International Center for Social and Labor Relations will be established in our country with the assistance of the ILO and West European countries. Some 5,000 specialists for the state employment service, who are proficient in administering the labor market, will be trained at the center.

Responding to a question from a TRUD correspondent as to what, in the ILO's view, are the paramount tasks of Soviet trade unions in connection with the forthcoming congress, M. Hansenne said: "We have a general rule in the ILO that says that we should not interfere in the affairs of our members. If there is some kind of problem that we are asked to help with, we gladly express our opinion or make a finding. And, secondly, and this is primary: The fact is that the ILO is an organization that, since the time of its foundation, occupies itself with the construction of order in the sphere of international regulation of labor so that certain labor standards are respected in the whole world, and we are very attentive to this."

"During my meeting with representatives of Soviet trade unions," the director general of the International Labor Office added, "one of the main subjects of the conversations was the place and legal guarantees of trade union organizations in the process of changes in the Soviet Union. At the request of the Soviet side, we made several proposals with respect to the draft law on trade unions. This document will be studied in detail by our specialists in Geneva, and our official opinion will be submitted both to trade union organizations and to representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Gorbachev Sends Message to Global Forum on Family

PM2310090990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Undated M. Gorbachev message "To the Participants in the 'Global Family Policy and Family Rights: Present and Future' International Conference"]

[Text] I sincerely greet the participants in the "Global Family Policy and Family Rights: Present and Future" international conference.

Mankind is increasingly aware of the abiding value of the family—the most fundamental of all foundations. As the proverb runs: A strong family means a strong country. There is no task more noble than to protect the home and preserve the family as a source of the personal happiness and well-being of millions of people on earth.

Perestroyka and the new thinking have brought about radical transformations in all spheres of Soviet society's life aimed at people's free and harmonious development.

It is difficult to maintain warmth and light in people's homes in a world wearied by mistrust and enmity. But the contradictory life of the world community has begun to change for the better. The depth and reliability of this process depends on us all.

I wish your conference successful work. I hope that the exchange of ideas and experience will be useful and make an important contribution to the preparation and conduct of the United Nations' International Year of the Family in 1994.

Bovin Views Ties With Korea, China, Japan

PM2210155190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Union Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin commentary under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "Asian Perspective"]

[Text] I had wanted to write about E. Shevardnadze's visit to the PRC, the DPRK, and Japan immediately, while everything was still fresh. But the busy round of political contacts and talks connected with German unification and the flurry of diplomatic activity prompted by the Kuwait crisis forced me to switch to other subjects. A month has now passed. By journalists' standards, this is a vast gap. But I have decided to return to the minister's visit to Asia nevertheless. The Asian aspect of our foreign policy has very great significance for us. And every step that clarifies and increases mutual understanding with our eastern neighbors is very important.

First, a few general points. The transition to a new world order and a new quality of international relations presupposes their democratization and demilitarization on all continents throughout the world, which, naturally, also includes Asia. Moscow has apparently always understood this. But—again "always"—our Asian policy has been impaired by at least one vital shortcoming: the predominance of a party propaganda approach over political and diplomatic considerations. We have always loved wordy joint communiques, declarations containing large promises, statements of principle, and, even better, "treaties of friendship".... In this respect, Soviet diplomacy has always been generous and eloquent. But we have been far more modest and bashful when it has come to real commitment and the need to take real, practical steps attesting to the seriousness of our intentions. This, although not only this, can be seen as the explanation for the cautious attitude to the Soviet concept of collective security in Asia.

The sharp change of direction in Soviet foreign policy in the second half of the eighties has also affected Asian affairs. The situation in this region of the world is incomparably more difficult and complicated than in Europe. There are too many unresolved problems and conflict situations and too much discord and mistrust. The range of interests and aspirations is too great.

George Orwell's famous novel "Animal Farm" contains the even more famous phrase: "All animals are equal but some are more equal than others." Orwell's statement can also be applied to international life. Here too, everyone is equal but some are more equal than others. If we are talking about the framework of Asian security, it must be composed of stable, lasting relations of trust between powers such as China, India, Japan, and Indonesia. Plus the Eurasian Soviet Union. Plus the United States and Canada, which are not separated from Asia by the Pacific but brought closer to it.

Shevardnadze's talks with his Chinese colleague Qian Qichen should be viewed against this conceptual background.

The content of the talks in Harbin (and in Pyongyang and Tokyo) can be divided into two sections: the "musts," i.e. the Persian Gulf, Cambodia, the Korean Peninsula, Afghanistan, and the situation in Asia and the Pacific; and topics and problems specific to our relations with the country in question. The Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers agreed to open consulates in Khabarovsk and Shenyang and begin another round of consultations on the questions of both sides reducing their armed forces and strengthening confidence-building measures in the military sphere along the Soviet-Chinese border. The talks were businesslike, fruitful, and designed to bring the two powers closer together.

As with our country, China's main problem at present is within the country. Perestroyka. But a different kind of perestroyka.

The Chinese started earlier than we and have taken more radical action; they have their "500 days" a long way behind them and have achieved positive results in the economy, particularly in agriculture and light industry. There are noticeably more foodstuffs and consumer goods. But uncontrolled inflation and the vast scale of corruption, which has affected state and party apparatus alike, have forced them to step back. The economic experiment has been squeezed by the usual administrative methods.

The political crisis which flared up in China in summer 1989 underlined the problems caused by inadequate development of democracy and glasnost, as well as the government's determination not to allow events to develop unchecked. Policy now focuses on the demands of stability and the struggle against bourgeois liberalism. First order—then change: That, perhaps, is how one can sum up the Chinese comrades' present line of action. Moreover, I have the impression that some of our own comrades are ready to use China's experience. In fact, that is already happening in the economy, in my opinion.

Generally speaking, people in our country hold different views on China's experience. The accuracy of these views depends on the depth of knowledge. The more often Soviet and Chinese ministers meet and talk, the better they will be able to get to know each other, learn from each other, and treat the possibility that their views and opinions may not coincide in a calm fashion, free of resentment and irritation.

Ultimately, the sociopolitical map of the 21st century depends on how matters progress in the USSR and the PRC and in which direction and how relations develop between them.

The talks in Pyongyang had a different background. The Korean peninsula is a zone of one of the most potentially dangerous conflicts in Asia, the reason for which is the division of Korea. One war—a savage, ruthless war—has already devastated Korea, tearing through the country like wildfire. There does not appear to be any intention to go to war again. But the North, which has the 1950-1953 war on its conscience, continues to maintain a vast army with our help. More than 40,000 U.S. servicemen perform an insurance function in the South.

Naturally, in addition to current Soviet-Korean cooperation matters, the discussion with DPRK Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam dealt with the state of play at the unification talks, the possibility of joining the United Nations, and the prospects of relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea.

It was explained to our minister that Pyongyang's idea of a Democratic Confederative Republic of Korea does not propose the merging and unification of social structures but the elimination of mistrust and suspicion between North and South. With regard to the "No Tae-u formula" (the gradual formation of a "Korean national community"), it is (and I quote NODONG SINMUN) "unrealistic, deceitful, and divisive" and "a perfidious, deceptive trick." Thus the talks on unification continue. But, given the present regimes, no end is in sight. The specifics of development in North and South do not bring them closer together but set them increasingly apart.

Both Pyongyang and Seoul are agreeable to the idea of joining the United Nations before the country is unified. But Seoul insists on separate membership in order to gain two seats and two votes, whereas Pyongyang believes that they should request one shared seat, as this will bring them closer together....

Working on the basis of its state interests and general assessment of the situation on the peninsula and in Asia, the Soviet Union did not see any fundamental reasons why diplomatic relations should not be established between Moscow and Seoul.

The DPRK leadership is categorically opposed to this. Our minister was given a special memorandum containing the arguments (six separate points) against the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea. I do not know what E. Shevardnadze said, but, in my opinion, Pyongyang's arguments are unconvincing, because they are based on an unrealistic, illusory assessment of the prospects for unification.

IZVESTIYA readers will know that diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea on 30 September. The press organ of the Workers' Party of Korea Central Committee, NODONG SINMUN, has decided to "settle scores as appropriate" in this connection. The settling of scores goes like this: The establishment of diplomatic relations with South Korea, the newspaper claims, became possible when the Soviet Union found itself "in an abyss of bankruptcy and chaos" and dragging itself along a path of "degradation and decay," following the dictates of "perestroyka." In the final analysis, this signifies the Soviet Union's blatant inclusion in the basic strategy of the United States, which wants to consolidate the existence of "two Koreas," isolate the DPRK in the international arena, incline our country toward an "open doors" policy, and overthrow its socialist system. "Perfidy," "double-dealing hypocrisy," "treachery"—the newspaper is liberal in its choice of words....

The colorful language used by NODONG SINMUN forces us to recall times and morals which the Soviet Union has left far behind. It would be pointless and useless to protest. But history will protest one day. So too will perestroyka, which will come to the land of North Korea.

In Japan, essentially the most serious, difficult problem was that referred to by the Japanese as the "northern territories" problem. Taro Nakayama told his colleague that the Soviet Union must return to Japan the southern Kuril Islands, which it seized illegally: Kunashir, Iturup, and Shikotan, and also the Habomai group of islands. Only after this will full, extensive cooperation between the two countries be possible.

The Soviet stand has not been notable for its consistency. First, in 1956, we promised to give back Shikotan and Habomai. Then, in 1960, we retracted our promise. We advanced the theory that "there is no territorial problem" between Japan and the Soviet Union. Now, as far as I understand it, the existence of a problem has been admitted. It is proposed to start looking for a solution satisfactory to both sides.

The Japanese are piling on the pressure. Their official approach is essentially an ultimatum. This, for example, was written by SANKEI SHIMBUN: "The problem of the northern territories lies at the root of the Japanese people's mistrust of the Soviet Union. Our country's stand, which aims to achieve the restoration of all four islands at once, remains unchanged. Without a solution to this problem, relations of real trust cannot be built between Japan and the Soviet Union and there can be no progress in forming the Soviet Union's proposed security system in Asia and the Pacific.... Our government should clearly convey this view to the Soviet foreign minister." There is no room for reasonable compromise with this kind of approach. The terms for returning the "northern territories" to Japan are the only possible subject of discussion. It is hard to see this approach as constructive.

True, E. Shevardnadze formed the impression that "important changes" are taking place in Tokyo and that the Japanese leadership is prepared to discuss other questions of Soviet-Japanese relations in parallel with the problem of the "northern islands" and a peace treaty. As if confirming the existence of these changes, THE NEW YORK TIMES recently quoted E. Suzuki, head of one of Japan's leading economic organizations. "I am afraid," he said, "that Japan will be left behind if it continues to insist on a solution to the territorial problem as a condition of allowing Japanese enterprises to freely conclude major deals with the Soviets." A statement by T. Doi, chairman of the Japan Socialist Party Central Executive Committee, is also noteworthy: "The refusal to regulate Japanese-Soviet relations before the territorial problem has been resolved is a relapse into the Cold War."

Gorbachev will fly into Tokyo next spring. What proposals will he take with him? How will this postwar problem be resolved? This is one of the most difficult tasks facing our diplomacy. Throughout Asia as a whole—let us just remind ourselves of efforts to achieve a settlement in Cambodia, the crisis situations in the Near East and Middle East, Sri Lanka, the Sikhs in India, the Muslims in the Philippines, and so on and so forth—there is no such thing as an easy problem. The Asian equivalent of the "Helsinki process" will take far more time than the European version. Even if accelerating factors connected with the general transformation of the world order come into play.

Our active role in the affairs of Asia and the Asia-Pacific region really depends not so much on our policies—although it is desirable that they should be intelligent—as on the state of our economy and, more particularly, our economic development of the country's eastern seaboard. We will not be able to master this task ourselves in the foreseeable future. We need investments of foreign capital. Every visit by a Soviet statesman to Asia encourages the creation of the political conditions for attracting foreign investors. But however many Shevardnadzes we may have and however much of a Solomon they may be, we will not make any headway as long as we continue to cut ourselves off from potential partners with "closed" cities and territories, all kinds of intrigues with the ruble exchange rate, "cunning" legislation, and the absolute power that is still wielded by the incompetent bureaucratic apparatus.

The world is changing and will go on changing. If we are to help these changes, keep abreast of them at the very least, and not hold them back, we must change ourselves.

'International Observers Roundtable' Detailed

LD2210001190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 21 Oct 90

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator, with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades. The subject which for ten weeks now has hardly moved from center stage in international life, a subject which attracts universal attention—intense, acute attention—is Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and the situation—the extraordinarily situation—which has arisen in the Persian Gulf. It is this we want to talk about first today, given that...Well, I don't know what my colleagues feel but I get the impression that the threat of a military clash there is growing greater by the day....

[Bovin, interrupting] At least, not less....

[Levin] I would say even so that my feeling is that it is greater. At least the U.S. military leaders are making more hardline statements. And the Iraqi leadership, Saddam Husayn is emphasizing its reluctance—at least this is what it is doing in official terms—to look for any political ways to resolve the problem.

[Bovin] True. During this time there has been nothing new there in qualitative terms. But in the quantitative sphere there has indeed been an accumulation of troops and weaponry. There are now 54 states involved—some militarily, some in auxiliary roles—but 54 states in all now have a presence there. And all of this is under the leading U.S. role. The United States is saying that this is costing them a billion dollars a month. Of course this is spread out. Part is covered by their allies, part by the Arabs, but even so it is a pretty large, a colossal amount. After all, the United States is not in surplus.

There have been no human war losses yet. But 20 or so airmen, mostly U.S. airmen, have died in attempts to...

[changes thought] Well, low-level flying. These fighters fly at 50 or 45 meters, and at that height it is easy to crash. The ceiling has now been raised to 300 meters. But in general it is all rather unpleasant. And then there is the heat. So it is tough and enervating.

What can be done? The troops there—a huge mass of troops. The matter has to be worked out somehow. And Saddam Husayn has taken up the very worst position (?from the U.S. point of view). He is doing nothing. He (?is sitting tight), as though to say: I will move no further. Just leave me alone. After all, this is our native land from time immemorial. That is his position. He does not offer any provocation. The United States would like a good provocative excuse for going in for the kill and launching an attack. But as yet he is not giving them that excuse. And as yet everyone... [changes thought] Though I, for instance, am convinced that when it is necessary they themselves will come up with a good excuse. And even though U.S. congressmen might be unhappy about it, something like this is likely to happen.

So that is the situation at present. It is indeed likely that the United States is feeling that for God's sake they would like to get in there soon and get it finished. And naturally Saddam Husayn feels the opposite.

[Shishlin] The way I see it there is a good reason for what Viktor Nikolayevich is saying. War is now just about knocking at the door in the Persian Gulf. As for all these details which Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich mentioned about the heights at which aircraft fly, curious as they may be, of course... nevertheless what is more serious in my view is the efforts being made now to squeeze every last possibility out of the resources to seek the slightest path to a peaceful resolution of the problem....

[Bovin, interrupting] [words indistinct] There is just one path. To oblige Saddam Husayn to get out of Kuwait. There are absolutely no other paths. [Shishlin tries to respond, but Bovin continues] And to pretend that some kind of compromise is possible is absolutely [word indistinct]....

[Shishlin, interrupting] But who is pretending? Nobody is pretending.

[Bovin, interrupting] It looks that way sometimes.

[Shishlin] No. Nobody is pretending that. And, incidentally....

[Bovin, interrupting] Well, thank God for that....

[Shishlin, interrupting] ...incidentally even the Government of Kuwait—and I am talking about the legitimate Government of Kuwait—a mere two days ago advocated that the slightest chance for a peaceful resolution of the problem should be pursued....

[Bovin, interrupting] [passage indistinct]

[Shishlin] But everyone is talking about the need for a peaceful resolution of the problem, about the desire for a peaceful resolution of the problem. Yet war is coming ever closer. War is becoming ever more inevitable. And seen in this perspective, naturally, the buildup of weaponry there and, the main thing of all, Baghdad's actions themselves, its piratical actions, its reluctance to let go of what it has seized, its desire to hang on to both Kuwait and the hostages—these things are the detonator for the explosion which is now almost inevitable, even though everyone will end up a loser. The Soviet Union will be a loser. The United States will be a loser. Iraq will be a loser.

[Bovin] They will both be losers and winners because in the final analysis it is they who name the punishment.

[Shishlin] But that is simply one of the requirements dictated by the profound changes which have occurred in international developments....

[Bovin] [passage indistinct]

[Shishlin] If Iraq wins a prize, do you think then that all the efforts will have been wiped out, all the efforts that have been made to improve international relations?

[Bovin] Indeed, indeed, indeed, that is the very point. Of course.

[Levin] Well, an interesting thought was voiced this week by Baker when he said that the best hope for a peaceful resolution in the Persian Gulf crisis is to create a totally effective system for isolating the Iraqi regime politically, economically, and militarily. We know that the UN Security Council has already passed several resolutions on Iraq, laying particular emphasis on economic and political sanctions against Iraq. But how far are these sanctions effective? Ten weeks is not such a long time. Reports have appeared in some Western publications to the effect that Iraq, thanks to the money it was able to grab in Kuwait, has been able to set up in many countries what amounts virtually to an infrastructure of smugglers who by various means keep Iraq supplied with food, spare parts for weaponry, and so on.

[Bovin] No doubt there is something of the sort. But you will not get very far on smuggling. (?Can) a state survive on smuggling?

[Levin] But which state and what kind of smugglers?

[Bovin] A large state, large. There probably is such a network, I do not doubt that. And that may ease the situation just a bit, but the main things are outside smuggling. And here, in my view, sanctions are holding up pretty seriously. But we have to bear in mind that they have reserves. In general it is a question of dislodging that country with these sanctions, though assessments are very mixed. Some think it is a matter of a few weeks. Others put it at up to a year, a year for the sanctions to, so to speak, play a decisive role. So the experts themselves have very differing opinions. And I do not know whom to believe.

[Levin] In fact, in that same appearance before the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Baker made another statement, from which it emerges that the president, should he decide to launch a strike against Iraq, does not intend to consult Congress in advance. And, this means....

[Bovin] [passage indistinct]

[Levin] In effect, in effect that is how it was. And this in effect means that, as I see it, tension is growing sharply, literally by the day.

[Shishlin and Bovin together] Yes.

[Shishlin] So what we are talking about could happen at any moment, at any moment. And of course I would say even so the key to a settlement now lies, on the one hand, in the hands of the armed forces ranged against the Iraqi aggressors, and on the other, in Baghdad's hands. And so let us consider. Can we believe that Saddam Husayn will return to his senses...

[Bovin, interrupting] I think that when Primakov returned from Baghdad he said something about viewing his conversations there with a certain degree of optimism.

[Shishlin] A fraction more optimistically was what he said.

[Bovin] Well, alright, but he used the word optimistic, I remember.

[Levin] And he repeated it in Paris.

[Bovin] There you have it, then.

[Levin] [Word indistinct] with restrained optimism.

[Bovin] Here of course I am talking as a journalist, my position is a very selfish one. I need information. So when things come to a complete standstill and we can find out absolutely nothing about what is happening that is not much to my liking. What can there be to talk about? I mean, with Mitterrand. And what about with Bush? The positions are absolutely clear. Everything is defined. So what political nuances can be discussed at present with... I don't know... any state figure, if Saddam Husayn's position is unchangeable? Or else is it that there is a chance of shifting that position? Aha! In that case then it become interesting, if you can shift it. Then it is interesting to talk about that. But where is that chance?

[Shishlin] But I think we have already said at some time that one of Saddam Husayn's main miscalculations was perhaps his incorrect evaluation of the new state of East-West relations and probably also of the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Yes. And Saddam Husayn's way of playing it—his political game—as I see it goes as follows. He is trying to veil his aggression in the ethics of pan-Arab slogans and to portray himself in some way or other as practically nothing less than a fighter for the just cause of the Palestinians, a fighter against Israel, and so to dissolve this aggression in the Near East conflict as a whole. But of course he will not get away with this. It will not be accepted. Everyone realizes that the problem of a political settlement in the Near East conflict needs to be addressed. But the number one priority today is the restoration of Kuwait's independence and sovereignty, protection of the hostages—safeguarding the rights of those held as hostages, and making sure the aggression is not repeated—guarantees against fresh aggression.

[Bovin] And it has to be said that in this matter the Palestinians have taken a position which is far from being the best they could have taken.

[Shishlin] Yes, that is [words indistinct].

[Bovin] And quite honestly what 'Arafat is doing I see as... I don't know. Can an honest political figure conduct at this time such a policy as he is conducting? He is practically in favor of leaving part of the fruits of aggression in Iraq's hands. That is his line.

[Shishlin] I wonder whether or not you saw a report a few days ago—quite recently, actually—to the effect that somewhere or other 'Arafat had told somebody or other that Saddam Husayn is supposedly ready to withdraw his troops from Kuwait....

[Bovin, interrupting] If the Jews withdraw their troops from the West Bank. That is the offer.

[Shishlin] But that is an old...

[Bovin, interrupting] But that is what he was talking about. Does anyone really believe that there is anything in this? There is nothing in it.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you have just mentioned Saddam Hussayn's error in assessing the state of East-West affairs at present in general and those of the Soviet Union and United States in particular. This week we witnessed not the most brilliant but a noteworthy manifestation of these relations changing for the better. I mean U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney's visit to the Soviet Union and his meetings with President Gorbachev and Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze, not to mention numerous conversations with Yazov, the minister of defense. In the context of the events in the Persian Gulf, this visit can also serve as a fairly obvious reflection of the changes that are taking place.

[Shishlin] All the same, Viktor Nikolayevich, I would separate events in the Persian Gulf and Soviet-U.S. relations. Even though there was Helsinki and a good deal more—Primakov's talks with Bush—all the same, what was most important in Cheney's visit to the Soviet Union were the new relations between the Soviet Union and the United States in the military sphere. And the reason why basically I interrupted your own discourse is that I have come across the following view in the Soviet press, that the new political thinking has to be paid for and the Soviet Union should now send, not of course regular units but volunteers to the Persian Gulf to take part in military sanctions against Iraq. In my opinion this is a completely [word indistinct] idea.

[Bovin] (?Or then there was another idea) for the United States to get hold of tactical and strategic data on our weapons [words indistinct] in the possession of the Iraqis.

[Shishlin] That is right.

[Bovin] [Word indistinct] data. And so someone spoke of Cheney as a superspy, a legal one! [laughter]

[Levin] When I was saying what I thought I had something entirely different in mind. I agree with you entirely. They are different things, the events in the Persian Gulf. However, since there was talk in general terms of the Persian Gulf and Mikhail Gorbachev, according to official reports...

[Bovin, interrupting] Which is quite correct.

[Levin, continuing]...confirmed in his conversation with Cheney that the Helsinki accords remain in force. I do think that there is at least an external connection. As for having to pay, in my opinion what Cheney said during his conversation with Shevardnadze has not yet been assessed widely enough. He said that in light of developments in Soviet-U.S. relations, the Pentagon is beginning to move toward a review of its strategic planning and has already come to the conclusion that it would, in the next five years, be expedient to cut military spending by a total of $180 billion over five years and to reduce the number of U.S. troops by 20-25 percent over the same period of time. This has a direct bearing on talk....

[Bovin, interrupting] There should be a huge cut here after which comes the following: At the same time as conserving all the main programs for modernizing strategic weapons. I mean what they are removing would be removed by time anyway. What they are retaining is what is most up-to-date. I do not think this is a criticism. We do the same ourselves and so do many others but we should show ourselves the real picture. That is what it is like.

[Levin] Yes.

[Bovin] The MX program, the submarine program, the bomber program are all being carried out today. SDI has been slowed down, though they are still doing the odd couple of tests a year.

[Levin] That is perfectly true.

[Bovin] As for the rest, of course they are closing down old bases. Some individual weapons are being destroyed. And we are doing the same and will continue to, thank goodness.

[Levin] Right, but and here I have had a look and cutting the military budget by $180 billion means that the United States will be cutting it by approximately by $36 trillion a year. For the next financial year the reductions amount to $18 billion. We can therefore calculate that these reduction will get under way not next year but the one after that. When Cheney talks of beginning to review strategic planning I am not convinced that all these programs they are implementing today under modernization will develop as steadily as they are at the moment. After all, all these programs developed primarily to oppose the Soviet Union. Where is the need for the MX program if everything is okay with the Soviet Union? Of course, far from all issues have been removed for either the United States or ourselves. The treaty on strategic offensive weapons reductions appears to be taking fairly clear shape already but it is still not ready.

[Bovin] It is almost ready.

[Levin] Nonetheless, there are still talks to come between Shevardnadze and Baker in Washington but it is (?in the offing). This treaty is the first step. It is of course a long road but the actual direction of movement and the reductions that are actually being made—well, we too are not yet destroying our very latest weapons, nor do we claim that we are.

[Shishlin] But we do have a real picture.

[Bovin] Cuts are needed both here and there.

[Levin] Yes, but some of our comrades think that we are the only ones making cuts and thereby undermining the defense capability of our country while the United States is hanging on to everything.

[Bovin] It is just that we have more to cut back. If we bought ourselves 20 pistols and the United States has 10, we have to say that we have more.

[Levin] But a lot of people still do not want to see this.

[Bovin] That is the problem [words indistinct].

[Levin] Let us come back to the essentials of this problem and of course the fact that relations are undergoing such development between the military departments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America is evidence of a growth in confidence and confidence is a very serious foundation for a realistic and civilized policy.

[Shishlin] You know, I keep on thinking that perhaps because we are so caught up and (?absorbed) in our domestic affairs, our domestic difficulties, our domestic passions, the U.S. defense secretary's visit does not seem a significant event to the general public. Why not? Because it has already entered the public consciousness somehow that Soviet-U.S. relations have already taken a new course and assumed a new quality.

[Levin] It is easy to get used to something good.

[Shishlin] That is right. And there is a quantitive buildup, as it were, because the new quality has already come into being. It came into being earlier. I think that at this level we must realize that each of these steps—the Cheney visit, Eduard Ambrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to Vienna....

[Bovin, interrupting] Or what about Afanasyevskiy's appointment as permanent representative to NATO in Brussels? Is that not part of the same story, so to speak?

[Shishlin] Yes. It is all part of some extremely important work which shows that we are still at the beginning of the road to restructuring international relations and putting those relations onto a new footing. From this point of view what you were saying—and I understand that you were not basically quarreling with one another. Of course there are sufficient problems in modern day international and military relations. Both the Soviet Union and the United States remain superpowers with, incidentally, their own fears, their own caution with regard to one another.

[Bovin] And with their abundant nuclear potential.

[Shishlin] Of course. And therefore such trends toward curtailing the arms race could be the deciding condition for a genuine improvement in world politics and a genuine deciding condition for moving from the era of confrontation we appear to be ending to one of cooperation, confidence, mutual understanding, and good deeds undertaken together.

[Bovin] I have to come back a little to Kuwait at this point to offer the following idea: It will be fine if we disarm and at the same time, by dint of our efforts the Third World acquires weapons. How will all this look in about 50 years' time? We have to think about that as well. In addition to everything else, we and the United States, and not just the United States, need somehow to reach agreements on the arms trade—no doubt one of the most important tasks of the next stage so to speak of talks. So that there is not... well, the militarization of the Third World is proceeding at a great rate, a great rate, and we need to react to this in some way and to try and do something.

[Levin] Speaking at the USSR Supreme Soviet session last Monday, Shevardnadze raised that question and said that it is a very important problem. And he expressed the idea that we and the United States cannot resolve it together since it must be addressed at a forum of the international community.

[Bovin] I have said it before and I am saying it now: The paradox lies in the fact that the largest important arms exporters are the five permanent members of the Security Council.

[Levin] Well, I would like to go back again to the idea expressed by Nikolay Vladimirovich that we are indeed becoming accustomed to good things. Yet truly enormous problems will still need to be tackled in the future and state leaders are to play a special role in this. For example, we know that this week the Nobel peace prize was awarded to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and in Vienna during his meeting with Shevardnadze, Roland Dumas, French minister of foreign affairs, specially noted that President Francois Mitterrand will be very happy to congratulate Gorbachev personally on his receipt of this award. We must bear in mind that what is involved here is the international prestige of our leader and the international prestige of our state....

[Bovin, interrupting] These are somehow two different things, incidentally. [Words indistinct] world public opinion and the prestige of our leader is considerably greater than the prestige of our state on all possible levels known to us.

[Levin] In this particular case what I have in mind is something a little different. The international prestige of our leader strengthens our state. It works for the state. And every citizen of our state must be protective of and must realize this. And at the Vienna meeting Shevardnadze and Dumas talked about preparation for the Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to France. This visit will take place next week. First of all Mikhail Sergeyevich will pay a visit to Spain and then on 28-29 October he will visit France. And a very important document has already been prepared—a treaty on concord and cooperation.

[Bovin] Entente cordiale.

[Levin] Well, the words cordial concord are not yet mentioned in the title of the treaty. But incidentally the very title shows how deep-rooted relations between our states are. Relations between us are traditional and they are developing. In particular, the following question arises: We know that in November the leaders of the 34 states of Europe and the United States of America and Canada will be holding a meeting at which they intend to adopt a document on a new stage of cooperation etc., etc.,

[Shishlin] I think Albania is to take part in the meeting as an observer.

[Levin] Yes, as an observer, but not yet as a permanent member because Western powers are setting up unexpected obstacles.

[Bovin laughs] I think that Latvia and Lithuania are to take part in the capacity of observers as well.

[Levin] This is also possible. Continuing the subject, bilateral relations are underpinning the whole all-European edifice and are working on it very actively. Indeed here there are no stereotypical answers. Indeed some comrades tend to perceive the visits as almost pleasure trips. But they involve major and serious work despite the fact that ministers and foreign policy departments—I have in mind specifically the USSR and France—have carried out enormous work. The presidents will still have things to do and things to say. And they are the ones who make the final decisions.

[Shishlin] I think that we must still try to extend this improvement in relations between the USSR and the international community to our internal affairs, our internal concerns, and our internal problems, because the actual active work which is being carried out by our state in the international arena creates the necessary conditions for us to sort out our own affairs and come out onto a straight road.

[Levin] When we were coming back from Vienna with Eduard Amvrosyevich, he talked as usual to the journalists who accompanied him on the trip. The following idea popped up: Let us imagine what would happen if our current internal mess had been accompanied by an unstable international situation. There would have been none of the solutions or accomplishments which have been achieved in the last years, thanks to our active foreign policy and thanks to the implementation of the principles of the new political thinking. Indeed when one begins to consider this issue an alarming picture emerges. Today in its foreign aspect the security of our country is no doubt more reliable than it has ever been in all the years of its existence.

[Bovin] In the sense that there will be no war.

[Levin] Yes.

[Bovin] Of course it is pleasing to hear these words. But we all live in our state and all of us can see that this perestroyka, the fruits of perestroyka, the fruits of the perstroyka of the foreign policy are in evidence and are real and we are, to use the trivial expression, reaping them now. But of course this rift between the internal and the external situation should not last so long. We must tackle our internal tasks whatever happens. And if we fail to resolve them, to resolve these internal problems, I am afraid our foreign policy will also fail. Now there are, of course, the German, the Kuwaiti, and the Japanese questions. And there are many other questions. But the main issue for everyone is the Soviet question. Will we be able to resolve it? Will we be able to extricate the country from the pit into which we pushed it?

[Shishlin] Yes, and I think that the external conditions—I am now repeating the idea which has already been expressed here—provide a favorable international background.

[Levin] And of course we can be sure that the favorable development of the international political climate and the strengthening of our country's political relations with other states will have a favorable effect on the development of foreign economic ties and therefore on strengthening our economy and enhancing—though it is now difficult to even to pronounce the words—enhance its well-being. But it must come in the future and we believe that it will come.

Let me end our program with this, esteemed comrades. All the best, esteemed comrades. Thank you for your attention.

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Cheney's Moscow Visit

Holds News Conference With Yazov

PM2210143790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondents M. Zakharchuk and A. Pershin under the rubric: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center": "Yazov and Cheney: Discussion on Peace"]

[Text] The USSR and U.S. defense ministers held a news conference 19 October at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. It was opened by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov. He said, in particular, that the meetings with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, and Soviet parliamentarians were the highlights of the U.S. defense secretary's official visit to the Soviet Union. During the talks at the USSR Defense Ministry they discussed a whole series of issues pertaining to Soviet-U.S. relations, particularly in the military sphere. They examined the role of the USSR and the United States in the modern world, the state of talks between them, above all on disarmament problems, the situation in the Near East, and many other questions.

R. Cheney, who spoke next, noted that this was his fourth trip to the USSR in the last 15 years and his second visit to the Soviet Union as U.S. defense secretary. Next year I hope to welcome Marshal Yazov to the United States, R. Cheney said, and afford him as warm a welcome as I have received here. I am sure that our mutual dialogue will continue just as it is continuing between our presidents and the heads of our diplomatic departments.

Then answering numerous questions from journalists, R. Cheney talked in detail about the course of his official visit to the USSR. I liked the Soviet troops, he pointed out, and their professional training. The tactical exercise during which combat hardware and personnel were landed impressed me. I visited an aviation plant producing MiG-29 fighters. If I had enough money, Cheney joked, I would get a few aircraft like that.

We are now radically revising our military strategy, he continued. Previously U.S. Armed Forces were developed with a view to a possible conflict with the USSR. Now this problem does not exist. The United States does not view the USSR as its potential adversary. Radical transformations are under way in the Soviet Union in which we cannot fail to have confidence, although I myself was skeptical about these transformations in the recent past. The USSR is withdrawing its troops from Europe and cutting back its Armed Forces. Over the next five years we, too, will cut back our Armed Forces by 25 percent. Our troops in Europe will be reduced by approximately 40,000 men. We will keep 12-14 instead of 18 divisions and will maintain 450 instead of 600 ships. We view the future with optimism and want to engage in constructive cooperation with the Soviet Union in the military sphere. Fruitful dialogue is already taking place between our countries. This by no means signifies that all the differences have disappeared. But there have been very many changes for the better of late.

Answering questions about events in the Persian Gulf, R. Cheney expressed hope that the political and economic efforts being made by the United States and other states will ultimately compel the aggressor to withdraw his troops from Kuwait. However, the secretary did not rule out other possibilities for resolving this conflict.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov mainly backed his colleague in speaking about the ways of resolving the Persian Gulf conflict, noting that the use of military force is undesirable. He also humorously pointed out that he would not be averse to acquiring a few F-16 aircraft with their splendid specifications. But, to be serious, the USSR defense minister continued, R. Cheney's present visit to the Soviet Union has been remarkable above all in that we spoke more about peace than about arms. When I was in the United States, I was shown the U.S. Army's holy of holies. We also showed Mr. Cheney everything that he wanted to see. It is good that the period when we hid things from one another and fueled the enemy image is becoming a thing of the past.

The USSR defense minister received many questions regarding internal problems linked with the country's Armed Forces. In particular, journalists inquired whether the USSR military budget would be reduced. D.T. Yazov commented that the Supreme Soviet has still not resolved this question, but presumably the cut would amount to several billion rubles. He categorically rejected as groundless the rumors of a possible military coup in the country. "The USSR Armed Forces are part of the Soviet people and will never act against their people and their will," D.T. Yazov said. The claims that increased movement of troop units had been observed around Kiev were also a fabrication.

The USSR defense minister unequivocally favored holding military parades to mark the anniversary of Great October.

As regards the future of the Warsaw Pact D.T. Yazov said: "We are becoming convinced that its military organization is unnecessary. This problem will be discussed officially in the near future at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee." As for the future existence of the Warsaw Pact political structures, the minister stressed that until recently none of the Warsaw Pact countries, barring the GDR (in view of German unification), had expressed an intention to leave the political alliance.

The news conference took place on an optimistic note.

Discusses Military 'Openness'

LD2210145490 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The United States defense secretary, Richard Cheney, who spent four days visiting the Soviet Union last week, replied shortly before departure to a number of questions from Radio Moscow's Yuliya (Zheglova):

[Cheney] "We are changing our strategy and our doctrine as a result of changes in the Soviet Union and changes in Europe. We no longer believe it is necessary for us to be prepared to fight a major land war in Europe, for example, between NATO and the Warsaw Pact forces. As the Soviet Union withdraws from Eastern Europe, we will reduce our forces in Western Europe."

[Announcer] That idea underlay not only the interview but also the whole of Mr. Cheney's visit to the USSR. Many have found this profoundly optimistic vision for future American-Soviet military relations quite surprising.

As for the things which caused the American minister's dissatisfaction, there appeared to be just a few. Mr. Cheney suggested there should be more openness in military decision-making, particularly with regard to this country's military budget. Well, that is something the Soviet people themselves would like to see actually happen.

Anyway, the United States defense secretary said this lack of openness in military affairs gave no reasons for regarding the USSR as a source of threat. On his country's future plans, he had this to say:

[Cheney] "We will be focused more upon keeping forces that can deal with regional conflicts, the kind of thing we have now in the Persian Gulf rather than forces that are focused upon the Soviet Union in terms of the possibility of major conflict in Europe. We think that is a very significant change, to change from the doctrine we have pursued for 40-some years now, and it is possible because of the very significant improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations and because of the very positive changes we see occurring inside the Soviet Union."

[Announcer] Asked whether he thought a war in the Persian Gulf likely, Mr. Cheney said he did not rule out that possibility:

[Cheney] "We hope that the Persian Gulf matter can be resolved by peaceful means without resort to hostilities, but we have not ruled any option out. We do not know how it is going to be resolved, we do not know yet whether or not the sanctions will be effective, and, therefore, we are in a position where today we cannot rule out other options."

Sees Positive Results

PM2210145190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by Major M. Zheglov: "Visit Over"]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney, who was paying an official visit to our country at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, member of the Presidential Council and USSR defense minister, visited the "Znamya Truda" Plant 19 October. The guest was given an opportunity to study the production of aviation technology and meet with specialists employed at the enterprise.

On the same day, R. Cheney and his entourage left the Soviet Union. They were seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by: Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov; Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General V.I. Varennikov, USSR deputy defense minister; Army General I.M. Tretyak; Colonel General of Aviation Ye.I. Shaposhnikov; Army General V.M. Shabanov, and other officials.

The send-off party included J. Joyce, U.S. charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, and Brigadier General G. Govan, defense attache at the U.S. Embassy in the USSR.

The U.S. and USSR state flags were hoisted at the airport, an honor guard formed on the airfield, and the two countries' national anthems played.

Before R. Cheney's departure, the USSR and U.S. defense ministers held a news conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center.

Speaking at the news conference, USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov and U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney assessed highly the significance of the official visit by the U.S. military department head to our country. A broad range of problems in Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed and the role of the Soviet Union and the United States in the modern world examined during meetings with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, and in the course of talks at the USSR Defense Ministry. Attention centered on disarmament problems above all, along with the situation in the Near East. Noting the importance of dialogue, the U.S. defense secretary expressed confidence that it will help to further develop mutual understanding and deepen trust between our countries.

Answering numerous questions from Soviet and foreign journalists, R. Cheney stressed that the United States is currently making fundamental changes to its military strategy, which was founded on the possibility of global confrontation with the USSR.

No one can now deny that positive results have been attained in the development of arms control, notably, for instance, progress in the sphere of conventional arms cuts. Moreover, the Soviet Union is today cutting back its troops and withdrawing them from Europe. In this connection over the next five years, R. Cheney continued, the United States intends to reduce its Armed Forces by roughly 25 percent. The number of American servicemen in Europe will be reduced by 40,000 men. There will be 12-14 instead of the current 18 regular troop divisions. The naval forces will have roughly 450 instead of the previously planned 600 warships. This will ultimately result in a significant reduction in the military budget.

The United States no longer regards the Soviet Union as a potential adversary, R. Cheney said, it wants constructive cooperation with it and regards the future with optimism. Fruitful dialogue is under way between our countries, but this does not mean that all our differences have disappeared. I would not recommend that the United States abandon strategic offensive arms, R. Cheney said, since the USSR possesses such weapons. But it is important to point out that this concern may be relieved at the appropriate talks.

Answering questions about the situation in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. defense secretary expressed hope that the political and economic sanctions adopted by his country and other states will ultimately compel Iraq to end its aggression and withdraw its troops from Kuwait. The United States is not abandoning this policy, but does not rule out other options for settling the crisis.

Answering the same question, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov once again recalled the importance of seeking political solutions to the Persian Gulf conflict. In his opinion, the use of military force there is undesirable.

He also said that it was problems of preserving peace and not problems of arms that were the main topic of his conversations with the U.S. defense secretary. D.T. Yazov explained certain aspects of the modernization of strategic offensive arms. The Soviet defense minister linked this not with the USSR's desire to constantly increase the number of its missiles, but with the technical need to replace them. He said that there will be a corresponding reduction in missile production following strategic offensive arms cuts.

The USSR defense minister received many questions concerning the country's domestic problems and relating to the life and activity of the Armed Forces. For instance, journalists were interested in the possibility of reducing the military budget next year. D.T. Yazov said that this question is being resolved by the USSR Supreme Soviet but has still not been resolved. However, it can be said for starters that this reduction will total 5-6 billion rubles.

He categorically denied—as groundless—the rumors of the possibility of a military coup in the country. "The USSR Armed Forces are part of the Soviet people and will never act against them or against their will," D.T. Yazov said.

With regard to the future of the Warsaw Pact, D.T. Yazov said: "We are becoming convinced that its military organization is unnecessary. In the near future this question will be examined officially at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee. As for the future existence of the Warsaw Pact's political structures, until recently none of its member countries, barring the GDR, said that they were leaving the political alliance, the minister stressed.

Answers were also given to other questions from journalists.

Northeast Asia

Deputy Electronics Minister Speaks on ROK Ties

SK2210043590 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Report of an interview with (?Aleksey Inauri) by station reporter (Vasiliy Kabayev); from the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program; (?Inauri's) comments in Russian fading into Korean translation, read by announcer—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Some time ago the mass media reported that a contract was signed between the Soviet Ministry of the Electronics Industry and the ROK company Samsung Electronics for the supply of electronic appliances to the Soviet Union.

Our station reporter, (Vasiliy Kabayev), met (?Aleksey Inauri), Soviet deputy minister of the Electronics Industry, and asked him to tell the listeners about cooperation with ROK companies.

He said: [Begin (?Inauri) recording] We have had relations with the ROK companies for two and a half years. Our two major partners are Samsung and Lucky-Goldstar. We currently are jointly producing with Samsung household video cassette recorders (BMZ-8220) at the (Volnes) plant.

As for the report you just mentioned, the Ministry of Electronics Industry delegation visited the ROK last September and toured Samsung Electronics Company's plants. But we did not sign a contract on the purchase of electronics at that time because our ministry is not charged with trading business. We worked out a plan for future technological cooperation with Samsung for the production of video cassette recorders and other household electronics devices, and we reached an agreement on this.

As far as I know, Samsung Electronics has considerable experience in the mass production of electric appliances, which is based on development by the company itself.

During our visit to the ROK, we discussed selling it products of the enterprises under our ministry, such as types of super integrated circuits and powerful transistors. We also discussed the possibility of jointly developing new types of household appliances. The Samsung representatives highly value the scientific potential the Soviet Union possesses. I think our cooperation with the ROK in the production of household electric appliances offers us very good prospects for the future.

The high standard of success of the ROK companies and the Soviet enterprises comes from the large demand in our country for this type of goods. I believe our joint work will turn out to be successful and mutually advantageous.

[Kabayev] Did you discuss with Samsung the joint development of industrial electric appliances?

[Begin (?Inauri) recording] That has not been discussed. As of today, there are various limitations in the electronics field. These limitations are imposed either by the state or the company. For instance, there are items that fall under the well-known Coordinating Committee for Export to Communist Areas. The production facilities for household appliances, therefore, are the most promising area. This does not prevent the possibility of conducting joint research work in the direction where technological exchange is permitted.

[Kabayev] In the meantime, he mentioned the issue of cooperation with the large ROK business group Samsung. At present, many Soviet enterprises are given the right to independently form external economic relations. What is your view on the prospect for forming relations with the small- and medium-sized ROK companies?

[Begin (?Inauri) recording] We had the opportunity to understand the success of these companies through the exhibitions held in the Soviet Union. Now that diplomatic relations are established between the two countries, I think there are many areas offering potential for developing relations with various ROK companies, as well as the large companies such as Samsung and Lucky-Goldstar, to mutual advantage. We are prepared to cooperate with any country's businessmen if they have hopes, energy, and sincerity for this.

ROK-Backed Timber Project Starts in Svetlyy Bay

PM2210102590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Report by I. Lebedeva; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Maritime Kray inhabitants are finding that learning to live in conditions of a free economic zone is not easy. The proposal to set up the first joint venture for the comprehensive processing of timber in the east of the country sparked a heated debate at a kray soviet session. The founder members are the Primorsk-Lesprom production association and a major South Korean corporation, Hyundai. The implementation of this project will enable timber processing workers to create our country's first waste-free timber processing enterprise.

[Reporter] Svetlyy Bay is about to get a new lease of life. Preparations are under way here to establish a joint venture for the comprehensive processing of timber in cooperation with the South Korean Hyundai corporation. A new 250-meter quay is being built. Dredging work is under way to deepen the bay. This is the equipment which will operate on the wharves of the new international port. The management of the Primorsk-Lesprom has just taken delivery of this barge, which is equipped with everything that is needed to start up work.

I have seen so many construction projects in our closed zones that this seems like a fairy tale.

[Unidentified port official] It is like a fairy tale. The production level and flexibility are very high here. It is an enourmous task to assemble all this on the spot in a matter of days. [video shows modern port equipment]

[Reporter] This foreign equipment looks strangely incongruous against the local backdrop. Svetlyy was once a Gulag camp. Nothing has changed since that time, except that the watch towers and the barbed wire have been removed.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S.-Philippines November Base Talks Viewed

HK2310041590 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Latest reports say that renewed talks between Manila and Washington on the issue of the future of the military bases in the Philippines are scheduled for next month. This will be the third round of talks, and many analysts believe this latest round is the most important one. This is because during past negotiations, both sides were aware that the Pentagon will be cutting back on its activities in the Philippines.

In the coming talks, the scope and time-frame for the reduction of the U.S. military forces in the country will be tackled. Various reports indicate that Washington, even though it is experiencing financial problems, has no intention of dismantling its bases in the Philippines, which are of strategic importance in the Asian-Pacific region.

Washington's thinking is that the U.S. Air Force and Navy should continue to enjoy the right to use the facilities at Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base, should a new agreement be drawn up.

However, for Manila's part, the government believes it should have full control of the bases. Hence analysts are focusing on the proposal, submitted to the Aquino government by a commission, that Clark should be turned into an international airport and Subic should become a repair facility for commercial shipping.

However, experts say this scheme is aimed mainly at producing a large political effect rather than addressing the issue of the nation's economy.

Meanwhile Washington is suggesting a plan that may be accepted by Manila, involving the fact that the economic benefits to be gained by Filipinos rest mainly on the bases' retention.

For his part, Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus has said that whatever transpires, Manila's position on the bases will not change. He told journalists that Manila's position is clear: Clark should be turned over to the Philippines by the United States by September next year. But Health Secretary and Philippine panel member Alran Bengson has said that the issue of Clark Air Base will not be discussed next month.

Observers are saying that Manila's position will remain firm on this issue, and that its stand on limiting the presence of foreign troops in the region will harden, compared to the position taken in past years.

Researcher's Book on Philippines Reviewed

HK2010064390 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Text] (Sinanye), a publication house in the USSR, has published a book on the Philippines entitled, "From Dictatorship Towards Democracy" written by Yuriy Andreyev, a Soviet researcher. According to experts, this is the first book on the Philippines ever published in the USSR which gives a detailed account by a Soviet on the political changes in the Philippines which took place in the mid-1980's. Copies of Andreyev's book may be found in different parts of the USSR.

The first part of the book tackles the crisis which the Philippines faced during the dictatorship of former president Ferdinand Marcos. This part includes the industrial collapse in the country, the drop in gross national product [GNP], increasing foreign debt, the failure of the economy, and decline in the standard of living. During this crisis, Manila's position in the world community was affected, and political movements and social unrest were uncontrolled by the reigning regime.

According to Andreyev, he believes that the union of church and opposition groups against dictatorship were responsible for the strengthening of political movements and subsequent fall of the Marcos regime. This was further reinforced when Juan Ponce Enrile, now a senator and formerly defense minister during the Marcos government, joined forces with the group of President Corazon Aquino. In the established coalition, foremost in the program of the Aquino government was reconciliation and the establishment of social reforms.

Andreyev's book also covers the problems which the current Aquino government faces, particularly those relating to the political situation in the Philippines. Another part of the book tackles the standard of living in the Philippines, its relationships with financial institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank, as well as other nations to which the Philippines is indebted.

Also contained in the book are Philippine foreign policy and the relations between Manila and Moscow. According to Andreyev, there has been a big change in the relationship between the USSR and the Philippines since President Aquino was put into power.

Andreyev says that in March 1988 a protocol was signed calling for regular political consultations between the foreign relations departments of both the USSR and the Philippines. According to the author, this document laid the foundation for widening political discussions between both countries. In this part of the book, Andreyev calls attention to Edward Shevardnadze, USSR foreign affairs minister's, visit to Manila in December 1988. During talks conducted in Manila, the USSR and the Philippines shared common views on world issues particularly that of a decrease in the arms race.

Andreyev adds that Manila accepted the initiatives proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev at Vladivostok and Krasnayarsk positively; according to Manila, Gorbachev's ideas were similar to that of ASEAN's [Association of Southeast Asian Nations] for the region. Andreyev further adds that according to Manila, the USSR's proposals for disarmament would help in improving the world situation particularly in the Asian-Pacific Region.

The author says that Shevardnadze's Manila visit was a qualifying step towards strethening bilateral relations between the USSR and the Philippines. Andreyev also gives importance to Secretary of Foreign Affairs Raul Manglapus' 1989 visit to Moscow. He said that this was evidence of the understanding between both countries as a result of Shevardnadze's visit to Manila.

During Manglapus' visit to Moscow, several documents were signed such as provisions for cultural exchange between Moscow and Manila for 1989-1990. The strengthening of trade relations were also mentioned and representatives in the talks agreed that the volume of trade between both countries should increase by five times its present volume. Accords in the areas of technology, science, and the establishment of a permanent Soviet-Philippine commission on trade, economic, scientific and technological cooperation which would strengthen the cooperation process between Manila and Moscow were signed into agreement.

In closing, Andreyev says that all issues mentioned will only serve to strengthen the friendship between the Philippines and the USSR in the coming days.

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Persian Gulf Crisis

Heath's Visit to Iraq Viewed

LD2310103190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Excerpts] Former British prime minister Edward Heath has been in Baghdad for two days holding talks with the Iraqi authorities for the return of a group of British citizens. Here is our special correspondent in London, Aleksandr Malikov:

Both 10 Downing Street—the prime minister's residence—and the British Foreign Ministry have welcomed the possible release of hostages, regardless of how many are freed. One can hardly agree with those, both in the Conservative Party and among politicians in the European Community, who have criticized Edward Heath on the grounds that his visit is playing into the hands of Saddam Husayn. Of course, he wants to demonstrate, by releasing foreign hostages in small groups, that it is possible to reach agreement with him on other issues, too, but this is far from meaning that his partners in talks think the same way. In any case, Edward Heath has taken upon himself no political commitments in exchange for the release of a group of British citizens. [passage omitted]

In the course of three hours of talks with Edward Heath, the Iraqi president said that he wants a political settlement of the situation in the Persian Gulf area. For the world community, however, declarations of good intent alone are clearly not sufficient. Practical steps are needed, and he [as heard] set these out very clearly and distinctly. There is one other thing which is evident. The presence of a large number of foreign citizens in Iraq and Kuwait—not of their own free will, but under coercion—merely complicates the matter of a settlement.

Kuwaiti Envoy's Assessments Noted

PM2210132190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with 'Abd-al-Muhsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj, Kuwaiti ambassador to the USSR, by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Ostalskiy; place and date not given: "Kuwaiti Ambassador: 'Most Arabs Are With Us'"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] At a time when the whole world is following the situation in the Persian Gulf intently, wondering whether it will prove possible to avoid war, the Kuwaitis have rallied around their exiled government. The Kuwaiti People's Congress, involving representatives of all strata of the population including those who before the Iraqi invasion did not unconditionally back the policy pursued by the Kuwaiti official authorities, has been held in Saudi Arabia.

Now is not the time for dissension. "However different Kuwaitis' viewpoints are, they are still a single family telling the whole world that Kuwait's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity cannot be the subject of talks and deals"—this is a quotation from the final statement unanimously adopted by the congress participants. 'Abd-al-Muhsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj, Kuwaiti ambassador to the USSR, gave IZVESTIYA the text of this document. He also answered several of our correspondent's questions.

[Ostalskiy] Mr. Ambassador, does this harsh wording mean that Kuwaitis oppose the peaceful settlement of the Persian Gulf conflict?

[Al-Du'ayj] Not at all; on the contrary, both the Kuwaiti people and the government want a peaceful resolution of the crisis and would like to avoid bloodshed. But the whole point is that there can be no peaceful settlement without the unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from all Kuwaiti territory.

[Ostalskiy] But the world press everywhere is currently discussing the question of the possibility of a territorial compromise: For instance, Iraq would withdraw its troops from the bulk of Kuwait, but would keep the oilfields in the region to the south of al-Rumaylah....

[al-Du'ayj] Under no circumstances! We will never agree to that. Think about it: That is, after all, encouraging aggression. What justice, what international law, what "new thinking" can there be if the international community agrees to the possibility of territorial acquisition by force of arms!

[Ostalskiy] But what else is there to do if the UN sanctions against Iraq do not bear fruit?

[al-Du'ayj] If the embargo does not work, we will ask our friends at the United Nations to declare Saddam Husayn a war criminal with all the consequences which that entails. Not him alone but also other members of his regime who are actively promoting aggression, along with the officers who "distinguished themselves" by their particular brutality in taking reprisals against the peaceful Kuwaiti populace. We are collecting facts and we know names, and all this material is awaiting another Nuremberg.

[Ostalskiy] Are you really not at all afraid of war?

[al-Du'ayj] None of us wants war: We realize the disaster it may cause, for my people included. But there is no greater disaster than losing your homeland. That is why we are prepared to die sooner than tolerate occupation. I want to ask you this: What about Saddam Husayn, is he not afraid that his country, his people will perish? It is, after all, his actions that have brought about this tragic situation for everyone....

[Ostalskiy] People in some Arab countries do not seem to be in a hurry to condemn Baghdad's actions; on the contrary, they are maintaining very close relations with him. The idea of your political regime's "undemocratic" nature is being spread around, as if to justify its overthrow....

[al-Du'ayj] Not all monarchies are necessarily bad, and not all regimes which have seized power as a result of military coups, through the power of the gun, are necessarily good—history shows this with increasing frequency. I think that the decisions adopted by the Kuwaiti People's Congress, which quite freely and democratically confirmed Kuwaitis' general support for the legitimate government were the best response to the critics.

Further: Before the August invasion some people may have believed the stories that Kuwaitis are "lazy shaykhs with too much money and too little brain." Today the whole world has seen what our country's inhabitants are like. Kuwaitis are now on television and radio everywhere, giving newspaper interviews, showing off their knowledge of foreign languages and ability for logical thought, and the strength of their love for their crucified country. At the same time Iraqi ambassadors are hesitating, belatedly reading out bureaucratic statements from Baghdad, afraid to deviate from them by just a single letter.... Kuwait is no richer than Iraq at all. Our government has simply spent money to create the highest possible standard of living for the country's inhabitants and provide them with the highest possible standard of education, rather than stunning the world with its vast military machine and unprecedented police apparatus.

[Ostalskiy] Mr. Ambassador, let us return to current realities. What is your attitude to the problem of the foreign, above all the American military presence in the region? It seems to have provoked alarm among many Arabs.

[al-Du'ayj] Certainly this argument is, in my opinion, just a big joke. Listen, you can take different views of American policy, you can criticize it, but you must not allow yourself to be deceived into failing to see the prime cause of the problem—Iraqi aggression. Blind anti-Americanism where people, out of hatred for the United States, refused to see anything else has long been entrenched in the region. Moreover, the pre-1984 governments in the USSR were among the most assiduous in this respect. But times have changed now. We have the following expression in our country: "When a school closes down, its graduates soon disappear." But I want to state firmly that the impression that all Arabs support Saddam Husayn is false. It is simply a case of his supporters' making more noise. But the majority are with us and thus favor justice as opposed to the law of the fist.

Peace Organizations Issue Appeal

PM1710091090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under "Near East" rubric: "Appeal by Soviet Community"]

[Text] The Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace; the Soviet Committee for Peace, Disarmament, and Ecological Safety on the Seas and Oceans; and the Soviet Association of Maritime Law have issued an appeal condemning Iraq's aggression against Kuwait.

Wide circles of Soviet society—scientists, diplomats, lawyers, retired admirals and generals, and seafarers—express profound alarm and concern, the document says, at the continuing practice of grossly flouting the sovereignty and national integrity of small countries, which, in spite of the existing norms and principles of international law, remain defenseless in the face of states that are more powerful from a military point of view. This was particularly graphically confirmed, the authors of the appeal believe, by Iraq's recent aggression against Kuwait, its occupation of that country, and its refusal to withdraw its troops from the territory of Kuwait in spite of the UN Security Council resolution and the demands of world public opinion. The position taken by the Iraqi leadership may lead to the start of hostilities in the Near East with unpredictable consequences for all mankind.

Soviet peace supporters, the document stresses, resolutely condemn Iraq's actions, and express their solidarity with the people of Kuwait. The appeal puts forward a number of specific ideas for working out an additional mechanism of specific international legal guarantees for the security of small countries. In particular, attention is drawn to the role which could be played by UN joint naval forces and also by space observation devices, with the aid of which it might be possible to process information about the concentration of large military forces on the borders of small countries.

The authors of the document also consider it important for international centers to be set up under the United Nations, and also within nongovernmental public organizations, to study the security problems of small countries and work out specific international legal norms aimed at ensuring this security.

Examples of the repeated acts of aggression against small countries, the appeal notes, highlight the need to hold through UN channels a special international conference on questions of ensuring the security of small countries, and also to resolve peacefully the conflicts that exist in those countries.

Iraqi 'Anxiety' Over Soviet-U.S. Ties Noted

LD2110042490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2036 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent M. Osokin; from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] U.S. newspapers, describing the meeting between Kryuchkov and journalists, highlighted that Kryuchkov had hinted at the possibility of handing over to Washington intelligence data on Iraq.

On the eve of the visit by U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney to the Soviet Union, representatives of the defense secretary stated Cheney's desire to discuss this subject in Moscow. But on the day of his arrival, a report emerged from the press center of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was announced that we were not preparing to share military information and thereby violate the agreement that was in force with third countries.

Even before the visit, Baghdad stated that it might block the departure from Iraq of our experts if Moscow were to hand over secrets to Washington. This threat evidently betrays the anxiety of the Iraqi Government over the Soviet-American rapprochement. It is the first time that Iraq has permitted such a thing with regard to our country—but in general it has long been using foreign citizens as a shield, upon which very much depends. For example, the presence of Americans in Iraq obviously limits the United States' possibilities. If military actions were to flare up, the Iraqis could state that the Americans were killing Americans, and for the Bush administration that could become a catastrophe. And if Soviet citizens suffer in this as well, then people will come down on President Gorbachev, both from the left and from the right, and a new wave of criticism against the idea of American-Soviet rapprochement will rise.

In a word, Baghdad is as before trying to make citizens from different countries pawns in its game, the scale of which is frequently underestimated. And the scales are these: in Iraq there are still 2 million foreigners.

Returnees From Iraq Describe Conditions

91UF0054A Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by E. Zhurabayev: "Our People from Iraq—Impressions from the country experiencing an international blockade"]

[Text] Moscow—Hundreds of Soviet experts depart Baghdad for home every week on Aeroflot charter flights. I met with two of them in the all-Union association "Zarubezhneftegazstroy."

Natalya Romanova, a translator, worked in the "Zarubezhneftegazstroy" Baghdad office from December 1987 through October of this year. According to her, no one in Baghdad could sense any obvious preparation for the invasion of Kuwait; it all happened swiftly and unexpectedly. Judging by appearances, the majority of Iraqis are sincere in their support for Saddam Husayn and his raiding of Kuwait. They keep remembering that at some point in the past the territory of Kuwait was part of Iraq. Their widely held opinion of Kuwaitis views them as rich loafers who have betrayed the Palestinian interests and are now growing fat on oil they had usurped. Emotions are also stirred up by the fact, very sensitive for many Muslims, of the presence of American soldiers next to their holy places in Saudi Arabia.

I asked N. Romanova what the present attitude was toward Soviet people in Iraq.

In her view the Soviet people have traditionally been treated nicely, even though that country felt a painful blow when the USSR joined the international economic sanctions against Iraq. Many people assumed that we gave in to American pressure and were unable to figure out the situation completely. In any case, they did not treat Soviet experts as hostages, and did not use them to shield their military installations. The Iraqis would like our people to continue their work. However, unlike many other foreigners they were allowed to leave the country, although every person had to receive permission from the oil minister to be given an exit visa.

The situation in Baghdad is calm in general. It cannot be compared to the atmosphere that existed during the war with Iran, when the capital was bombarded with rockets. The sole outward signs of the present crisis are closed restaurants and shashlik cafes, lines to buy rationed food, and crowds of Asian refugees who spend the nights right on the streets. The picture is similar in other cities.

If things are comparatively quiet, my next question is, how would she explain the growing number of well-paid Soviet specialists who want to return home as soon as possible.

Natalya Romanova replies that fear of the future is the answer. The present confrontation in the region is on the verge of becoming a large-scale military action, with possible employment of weapons of mass destruction. The people worry about cancellation of regular air flights between the two countries: Nobody knows beforehand when the next charter flight is going to leave. There are problems with receiving mail from home, where all the wives and children have already been sent. There is practically no telephone communication. Another problem is that many experts cannot carry out their duties for the simple reason that due to the blockade their enterprises are not receiving the necessary supplies, both from the USSR and foreign firms.

I also spoke with Marat Gaynullin, a milling machine operator. Almost until the last minute he was working on construction of a section of the oil pipeline stretching from the rich deposits of North Rumaila to the city of al-Hadithah. He lived in the town of ad-Diwaniyah, 180 kilometers south of Baghdad.

Natalya Romanova based her story on her impressions of life in the capital, but Marat Gaynullin's impressions should be treated as the view from a provincial area. Here is what he told me.

Every time M. Gorbachev and E. Shevardnadze make a statement about the Persian Gulf crisis, the Iraqis insist that we are acting in cahoots with the imperialists. Even market vendors who seem to be far removed from politics refuse to sell food to Soviet people.

On the other hand, there are vendors at the same market who have to serve in the army for 15 days every month. This duty naturally interferes with their sales and occasionally, when nobody is listening, they harshly berate Husayn's regime. But they cannot say anything like that openly, of course.

Truck convoys carrying loot from Kuwait are constantly passing through ad-Diwaniyah. A lot of military hardware goes in the opposite direction. Soldiers in army trucks are singing songs, evidently in a combat mood.

The blockade of Iraq resulted in skyrocketing prices on literally all goods. According to Marat Gaynullin, most Iraqis learned their lesson in the war with Iran and now keep large supplies of food in their homes. Soviet experts used to get their supplies from a Yugoslav firm, but now they have to switch to the incredibly expensive local markets. There are centralized supplies of some food products that have been organized by the Iraqi authorities. But they provide only eight categories of food: rice, bread, vegetable oil, sugar, and some others. The amounts of these rations are not big—a kilo of rice, half a kilo of sugar per month per person. Under the continuing blockade these norms are expected to decrease. Due to all this the USSR sent several planeloads of food. But these supplies cannot last long if you remember that there are still about 5,000 of our compatriots in Iraq, and new supplies cannot arrive easily due to the blockade.

All these not-so-cheerful facts considered, many Soviet people decided to return home before the end of their contract term. People have to wait for months for a decision on their departure. Marat Gaynullin, for instance, handed in his exit application on 25 August but was not able to leave until as late as 8 October, and he considers himself lucky.

After I finished my two conversations, I stopped at the "Zarubezhneftegazstroy" personnel office. There I was told that all Soviet construction workers contracted by the organization who wanted to return home would be able to do so. So far, taking all the circumstances into account, their salaries have been increased by 20 percent, effective 1 October.

Fallout From Jerusalem Killings Continues

Arab League Council Meets

LD2010101190 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Timoshkin: "What the Meeting of the Arab League Council Revealed"]

[Text] The emergency meeting of the Arab League Council in Tunis and its results indicate that the League has had better times. Judge for yourselves.

Only eight foreign ministers participated in the emergency meeting called by the PLO. On its first day, sharp verbal disputes erupted between the representatives of Iraq and Kuwait, which is only natural, and also between the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

In this respect, the negative effects of the current Gulf crisis on the work of the Arab League appeared very clearly. Also, numerous disagreements appeared during the drafting of the final communique of the meeting. A number of delegates left the conference hall in protest because of their disapproval of this or that article of the resolution.

However, with extreme difficulty, a compromise document of 10 articles was adopted. This document condemned the crime of the Israeli occupiers in the Holy [Al-Aqsa] Mosque, stressed the right of the Arabs to Jerusalem and condemned its annexation by Israel, which made the Holy City into its united capital. The last article of the document condemned the pro-Israeli U.S. policy. The Arabs called on the United States to give more attention to their urgent issues. There are articles which stress the necessity of continuing to give financial aid and support to the Palestinian people's struggle for liberation and the heroic intifadah.

When we look at this document, it springs to mind that numerous previous Arab League documents included identical or similar expressions. However, many of the correct resolutions, firmly based, adopted by the various Arab conferences, remained unimplemented.

It is noteworthy to refer to the following characteristic in the resolution adopted yesterday in Tunis by the emergency meeting of the Arab League Council: The Arabs prefer to rely on the international community for solving the Palestinian issues and a number of other issues. For instance, the third article of the document announced the following: The international community should shoulder full responsibility in confronting the increasing Israeli ambitions. Naturally, we cannot object to presenting the matter in this form. Yes, the international community could do many useful things in solving the Palestinian problem and the other problems which preoccupy the Arabs. However, the Arabs themselves should play the principal role. They can now take a number of joint practical steps toward giving effective aid to the Palestinian people, not only to those who are carrying out the heroic liberating struggle in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, but also the hundreds of thousands of Palestinians who have become refugees anew as a result of the Iraqi aggression on Kuwait.

It was logical to expect the participants in the recent emergency meeting of the Arab League Council in Tunis to call for a political settlement for the Gulf crisis. This would be in the interest of all Arabs, including the Palestinian people and those participating in the intifadah. However, no such thing occurred, as we can see from the final document.

In my opinion, the reason for this is the Iraqi-Kuwait conflict which divided the Arab ranks. For this reason, we are unfortunately forced again today to talk about the ineffectiveness of the Arab factor in looking for solutions to the problems in the region.

Links With Gulf Crisis Noted

91UF0056A Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by Nikolay Baratov under rubric "TRUD Commentary": "How Can We Untangle It?"]

[Text] The anticipation of trouble which can be ignited by a dramatic confrontation in the Persian Gulf area between Iraq's Armed Forces and the international, mostly American, troops was added to last Monday by the tragedy that took place in East Jerusalem. During a Hebrew holiday Jews and Arabs clashed on the Temple Mount for religious reasons. The Israeli security forces interfered in the melee and opened fire on the Palestinians. As a result, not less than 23 people were killed and about 200 were wounded.

It was the bloodiest act of violence in Jerusalem not only since the beginning of the "intifadah" (the rebellion of the Palestinians against the invaders) in December 1987, but in all the 23 years of Israeli occupation of Arab territories. The act caused unanimous indignation among the entire world community; even the United States had to speak at the United Nations to condemn Israel's unjustified and cruel actions.

Should we link the situation in the Persian Gulf with the tragic events in the Israeli-occupied territories and also with what is happening in the Near East in general? In the view of some political leaders that is the only thing to do. Others object to such a "linkage." They think that mixing together the search for a peaceful solution in the Kuwaiti-Iraqi conflict and the crisis in Lebanon would mean an virtual approval of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait and support for Husayn, who makes the removal of his troops dependent on the solution of the tragic fate of the Palestinians and the Lebanese. "Saddam Husayn will feel stronger as a result, more prepared for decisive actions as he has received a wonderful present from Israel," the London INDEPENDENT wrote about this.

It must be mentioned here that the Iraqi leader in fact is trying to use the "massacre in Jerusalem" as a trump card in his propaganda, so that he can act as protector of all Arabs from their "arch-enemy" Israel and thus try to split the anti-Iraq coalition. At the same time, Iraq is attempting to draw world attention away from its own criminal acts—aggression against a sovereign state, the detention of hostages, and acts of torture in occupied Kuwait. As if the blood shed by one invader can atone for the crimes of another one.

As for the variety of opinions on "linking" all of these crucial problems, it all depends on how sincere the sides involved in the Near East conflict are in their desire to find a way out of the situation. If we try to make separate aspects of the problems dependent on each other, we may tangle the already complicated web even further, or provoke new explosive situations. Resolution of the composite parts of the Arab-Israeli puzzle must obviously follow parallel lines, i.e. simultaneously with the search for a way out of the cul-de-sac created by Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. We should encourage in every possible way the call for an international conference to design an "all-embracing peace formula" for the Near East which should include a solution of the Palestinian problem. And the United Nations should take a more and more active part in the attempts to untangle this mass of contradictions as the prestige and effectiveness of the organization have lately risen considerably.

'Wave of Terror' Seen

TA2210190390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy Prokofyev]

[Text] The Soviet public is very concerned by the recent increase in Palestinian violence in Jerusalem. Yesterday, a Bethlehem terrorist murdered two men and an 18-year-old girl and wounded a youth. Two Palestinian organizations claimed responsibility for this repulsive act: Fatah's Force 17 and the Islamic Jihad Movement.

Here is our commentator Dmitriy Prokofyev: I personally am particularly worried, and not only because of the repulsive act. I hope that the security forces would find means to overcome a new wave of terror. I am very worried by the fact that the Palestinian organizations are practically competing to murderer innocent people. This refers not only to the fire that broke out in Jerusalem yesterday. International press agencies reported that Fatah and Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] recently distributed leaflets calling for the killing of Jews at all times and everywhere.

Another cause of grave concern is the fact that the moderate figures of the Palestinian national movement—who until recently were thought by many in the world, including in the USSR, to be potential partners for political negotiations with Israel—no longer make public condemnations of the Arab terrorist acts. The impression is that they are simply afraid of the radical terrorists. Naturally, the bloody events in Jerusalem can be viewed in the overall context of the rise in violence in the Middle East, emanating from the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. This includes the killing of some 20 Arabs by the security forces after the attack on Jews at the Western Wall; the killing of some 150 Lebanese Christians in Beirut, including Maronite leader Dany Sham'un, by Syrian troops; and naturally, the crimes of the Iraqi regime.

It is possible that against the backdrop of all this violence, Palestinian terrorism in Jerusalem would seem marginal. This, however, is only hypothetical. The truth is that the acts of the Palestinian [word indistinct] could lead to grave consequences, not just for Israel, and not even just for the Middle East. Among many foreign visitors to the Middle East, the opinion is widely accepted that Saddam Husayn is using his radical Palestinian allies to divert the world's public opinion from the Kuwait crisis, and to shift the focus of political interest to the Israeli-Arab conflict.

I believe that the Iraqi tyrant is acting out of cool reason: Eventually Israel will have to take tough countermeasures, and then the Arab world would explode. Then, it would become apparent that the Arabs hate Israel above all, and Iraq's tyrant regime would split the Arab front against Baghdad and would direct the Arabs' energy against Jerusalem once more.

Under these circumstances, a lot depends on the imperturbable attitude of the Israeli leadership. At the moment, Israel's stand comes from [words indistinct] and restraint. Police Affairs Minister Roni Milo has rejected the appeals of the hardliners to allow Jerusalem police to open fire at (?armed) Arabs and shoot to kill. At the same time, in Israel's capital, the police prevented spontaneous acts of revenge against the Arabs, perpetrated by Israeli radicals. I hope that in the future, as well, the Israeli leadership adheres to this moderate line. Naturally, I understand that the success of calls for restraint when innocent people are being killed on the streets of the capital just for being Jews could be doubted. Nevertheless, I hope that when the international community puts an end to the source of terror in the Middle East, and the aggressive policies of Saddam Husayn, it would settle the accounts with those in the region and outside it who have acted for the Iraqi aggressor.

PLO's Al-'Abbas Interviewed

91UF0057A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 42, 17 Oct 90 p 14

[Interview with Palestinian Liberation Front leader Abu-al-'Abbas by IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK correspondent Yevgeniy Mikitenko for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA at the residence of Abu-al-'Abbas: "What Is Abu-al-'Abbas Fighting For?"—first two paragraphs are LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Text] I met with Abu-al-'Abbas, one of the leaders of the Palestinian opposition movement, the end of September, a day before returning home from my business trip. This odious character is mired in legend. In October 1985 his people seized the Achille Lauro in the Mediterranean Sea. At the end of May this year they conducted a daring attack by sea on the Israeli shore in the area of Tel Aviv. Some call Abu-al-'Abbas Terrorist Number One, others—a Palestinian freedom fighter and Che Guevara of modern times. What is he in fact?

...After my Palestinian friend phoned and told me that Abu-al-'Abbas was ready to meet with me, I expected something unusual—perhaps a trip to his residence lying face down in the back seat of a car. But everything took place in quite an ordinary fashion. A car drove up to the bureau building and my friend shouted "Follow me" through the open window. In a little while we stopped in front of an inconspicuous villa. A fellow in jeans and football shirt suddenly appeared from the bushes, and I was introduced to him as a friend. I did not notice right away in the darkness that the person I had just met was carrying a Kalashnikov over his shoulder. Then—down corridors and rooms, everywhere the affable faces of young lads drinking tea and coffee, discussing something in animated fashion. And here the office of Abu-al-'Abbas. A desk. A leather armchair. Several telephones. A bookcase. We took a seat and I posed my first question.

[Mikitenko] It is said that the American intelligence services are offering big money for your head. How much?

[al-'Abbas] Indeed, it is a considerable amount. I in turn would not give a penny for the heads of their leaders. During the Reagan period they put $500,000 on my head. Then George Bush raised the amount another $250,000 and promised to extend American citizenship to whoever killed me. Today I believe the Americans would pay a million dollars for this "sacred deed." But, as you can see, I am alive and safe, full of energy, and continuing my struggle.

[Mikitenko] Tell us a little about yourself.

[al-'Abbas] I am 41. I was born in a Palestinian refugee camp in Syria. My parents were banished by the Israelis from the Arab lands of Palestine. I was 10 years old when my mother died. Ten years later I lost my father. I have four brothers and one sister.

[Mikitenko] Have you traveled much?

[al-'Abbas] I have had occasion to travel to almost all the countries of the world. I just have not been to the United States. But I know a great deal about it from books and films. I have been to the Soviet Union several times. I am proud of the fact that I studied in Moscow at the beginning of the 1970's. I retain the fondest memories of the Soviet doctors who cared for me after I was wounded in Lebanon the summer of 1982 during the Israeli aggression.

[Mikitenko] They call you the Palestinian Che Guevara who uses a computer....

[al-'Abbas] Indeed, we strive to use all the most modern achievements of science in our struggle. You cannot wage a struggle for justice in the last decade of the 20th century using only a machine gun. Especially since Israel surpasses the Palestinians in the technological sphere. We have no atomic bomb, no missiles, no tanks. Then too, Tel Aviv has the full support of the most powerful state in the world, the United States. There, and in the West in general, they do not want to understand all the complexity and tragedy of the Palestinian problem. In the East, particularly in the Soviet Union, the problems of other countries and peoples have always been closer to the heart.

[Mikitenko] You head the Palestine Liberation Front, part of the PLO. Do you have many adherents?

[al-'Abbas] My organization is, in essence, a party. It encompasses many thousands of Palestinians. We have members and sympathizers in at least 36 countries of the world, including the Soviet Union.

[Mikitenko] They say you have your own airplane....

[al-'Abbas] No plane, but I do have a glider which can be used to fly to Israel to conduct operations.

[Mikitenko] Are you married?

[al-'Abbas] Yes. I have three children.

[Mikitenko] Many people think that following the invasion by Iraqi troops into Kuwait the Palestinian problem has been shifted to the background.

[al-'Abbas] It seems to me just the opposite. Finally it again comes to mind. Last summer the Americans cut off dialogue with the PLO when they failed to secure more concessions from us. Washington's words described progress in resolving the Palestinian problem. But in actuality the Americans simply wanted to win time, so that Israel might put an end to the Palestinian intifadah. After Iraqi troops were introduced into Kuwait and Saddam Husayn issued his well-known statements to the effect that the problem of Kuwait and the Palestinian problem must be resolved at the same time on the basis of all—and I stress all—United Nations resolutions, I believe we can finally see light at the end of the tunnel. This is addressed in recent statements by Soviet leaders and F. Mitterrand, which call for a peace conference to be conducted on the Near East. Before, the Palestinians were looked upon as refugees, people who required only sympathy. Today, now that Saddam Husayn has tied in our problems with Persian Gulf oil, it is becoming clear to everyone that, as part of the Arab nation, Palestinians are also tied in with oil—a product without which all of Western life may meet its end. It is a pity that the United States is continuing to say, as before, that the Palestinian problem must be resolved following a settlement in the Persian Gulf. Three or four months ago Israel selected negotiating partners from among the Palestinians and demanded concession after concession from 'Arafat, promising to resolve our problems. Everyone gave advice on how we should act "for the sake of peace throughout the world," not taking our problems seriously, not considering our rights. Today the problem of the Palestinians and the problem of oil for the West lie on the same scale. Therefore all Palestinians today side with Iraq in its confrontation with America.

[Mikitenko] Did Kuwait assist in the Palestinian intifadah?

[al-'Abbas] About 400,000 Palestinians lived and worked in Kuwait. A portion of their salaries went to a fund to aid the Arab people of Palestine. The emir of Kuwait also provided material assistance from time to time, but it was dozens of times less than what Kuwait provided the Afghan mujahidin.

[Mikitenko] How would you assess perestroyka in the USSR and Soviet Near East policy?

[al-'Abbas] It is difficult to give a brief answer to these questions. It is in the Soviet Union that I received help in understanding who is who in our world, what is evil and what is good. I carry these principles in my heart and have shared them with my people. The most important thing for me remains, as before, the struggle against exploiters and imperialists, against racism and Zionism, the struggle to achieve basic rights of Palestinians to have their own land. The Soviet Union remains, as before, a great world power. It is for it to decide what is more important for its interests. We Palestinians are very bitter at the mass exodus of Soviet Jews to Israel. And can it be in the interests of the USSR for American missiles, whose numbers were reduced in Europe, to again appear "around the corner" from Moscow—only this time not in the west, but in the south? I can understand how Turkey could be bought for millions, but I cannot imagine that it is possible to buy out the USSR—even for billions. After all, we should not forget that the Soviet Union has played and continues to play one of the two leading roles in the play entitled "The Future of All Mankind"....

[Mikitenko] The Western press has been reporting recently that Palestinians, with help from Iraq, are preparing a series of terrorist acts against the United States in various countries....

[al-'Abbas] The term "terrorist act" is a typical Western propaganda cliche. We do not even use the word "terror." It has appeared in the political vocabulary thanks to American efforts. When American soldiers kill the peaceful inhabitants of Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, and Panama—is this not terror? Is it not terror when Americans assemble 200,000 of their soldiers in the Persian Gulf region and force millions of Iraqi people guilty of nothing to suffer from malnutrition? Is it not terror when every day Palestinians are dying on occupied Arab lands? I am convinced that if it were not the Iraqis but rather the Israelis who seized Kuwait in August, America would have loudly applauded them. For the time being, Palestinians continue their struggle using machine guns and rocket-propelled grenades. And the Americans call this terror. We are proceeding in accordance with our capabilities. At the same time, America brandishes its Pershings and cruise missiles over the entire world. What do you call this? The cause of good?

[Mikitenko] How can world attention be focused on the Palestinian problem?

[al-'Abbas] This is what I am involved in. The tragedy of my people has been going on for 40 years now. I am calling for a political solution to the problem. But, unfortunately, political dialogue has not yet brought anything for the Palestinians. Hundreds have been killed in the intifadah, thousands thrown into Israeli jails. For how many more years can this continue? Brutality must be answered with brutality. I repeat—I am not against dialogue, but it must be equitable and honest. For we have nothing to lose. We do not have our own land, our own state. I am in favor of a political settlement, but against political illusions and deceit.

[Mikitenko] How would you assess news that the USSR and Israel have reestablished diplomatic relations?

[al-'Abbas] If the Soviet conditions were to be fulfilled here, namely the beginning of a process to attain a just Near East settlement, then I believe Palestinians would not be opposed to such a step. It seems to me that the Soviet emigration to Israel presents a greater danger to the Palestinian cause than the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv. But renewing diplomatic relations without the conditions Soviet leaders have declared will further undermine the trust of Arabs in the USSR, their historical friend. Israel is a poor country. Can you imagine what would happen to Israel without U.S. assistance? And today, when we see crisis in the Persian Gulf, Israel is itself seeking U.S. aid instead of defending U.S. interests. Many Americans are today asking Bush: Why must we put so many billions of dollars into Israel if it is not going to defend U.S. interests in the Near East? After all, if war breaks out in the Persian Gulf, it will be American soldiers dying for American interests and not Israelis. Under present conditions it would be unwise to reestablish diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel. The Arabs have a saying—"The pilgrimage to Mecca must be made at the right time." I think that today Israel's status as a strategic U.S. ally in the region has ended.

[Mikitenko] What are your thoughts on how events will further develop in the Persian Gulf?

[al-'Abbas] I can conjecture that the Americans will attack Iraq. But they will not succeed in destroying the new consciousness which has appeared in Arabs. It is possible that social explosions will take place in many Arab states, primarily Egypt and Syria. An unpredictable chain reaction will be set off—and not just in our region. [end Abu-al-'Abbas]

Terrorism is one of the calamities of our time. No matter what the intentions of Abu-al-'Abbas or Abu Nidal might be, or those of the "Red Brigades," "Sendero Luminoso," or "death squads," there has never been, is not now, and can never be any justification for terror against innocent people.

Last week a bloody drama was acted out in Israeli-occupied East Jerusalem, near the Islamic holy place, the Al-Aksa Mosque. Israeli police and soldiers opened fire on Arab demonstrators. About 30 Palestinians were killed and hundreds wounded.

How will Abu-al-'Abbas react? Will there be more bloodshed?

PLO Advisor Comments

LD2310091690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] [Announcer] As you know, despite UN resolutions, Israel is continuing its repressive actions in the occupied Arab territories. In this context, yesterday I met (Khalid al-Mihayri), an advisor at the Palestinian Embassy in Moscow.

[Begin recording] [Announcer] Khalid, more than a week has passed since the shooting of the Arab population in Jerusalem. Has anything changed over this period in the occupied territories?

[(al-Mihayri)] As you know, and as you continue to hear about what is happening in the occupied territory, after the carnage in Jerusalem, where 21 people were killed and more than 200 were injured, the Israeli authorities are again conducting repressive actions against civilian Palestinians in the occupied territory, and have wounded something like 30 more people. This is official policy on Israel's part, the purpose of which is to remove the Palestinians from their territory and to settle new immigrants there.

[Announcer] Probably from the USSR, too?

[(al-Mihayri)] Including and mostly from, the USSR, of course.

[Announcer] What measures does the PLO intend to take to avert repressive actions? Perhaps some kind of world sanctions?

[(al-Mihayri)] The PLO appealed both through the Arab group in the Security Council, and through the group of Nonaligned countries, to study the issue, and to study the events which have been taking place in Jerusalem. After five days of argument in the Security Council a resolution was adopted which condemns the Israeli authorities and which also decided on the need to send a commission to investigate the incident which took place in Jerusalem. You also know that Israel refused to accept the UN mission and has rejected the Security Council resolution. The PLO is resolutely continuing its political struggle against the occupiers. [end recording]

U.S., Israeli 'Antagonism' Seen

PM1910140790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by Vitaliy Gan: "'Turning Point?'"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Oct—Since the moment Washington succeeded in uniting the Arab states into some kind of coalition of opponents to the Iraqi seizure of Kuwait, the U.S. Administration has repeatedly asked Tel Aviv not to complicate the state of affairs in the region. Or, to use the American expression, to "keep a low profile." To the Americans' obvious disappointment and even irritation, the Israelis seem deliberately to be behaving as though they hear nothing and see nothing, jeopardizing the fruit of Washington's painstaking labor.

The recent reprisal against the Palestinians in Jerusalem, which resulted in the death of over 20 people and the wounding of hundreds, has generated a reaction on the Potomac which can only be described as angry. Out of fear of losing Arab support for its pressure on Saddam Husayn's regime, the Bush administration has even taken an unprecedented step—in contrast to the previous practice of many years of shielding Israel—voted with the other UN Security Council members for an admittedly somewhat watered down resolution condemning Tel Aviv's act of terror. Inasmuch as this has never happened before, observers here simultaneously started shouting about "the new, changing quality of U.S.-Israeli relations." It is hard to say whether they were too hasty.

Nonetheless it is possible now to speak at least of an amendment to Washington's traditional patronage of Israel. The grounds are the Israeli Government's refusal to recognize the Security Council resolution and receive a UN special commission to investigate the reasons for the bloodshed in Jerusalem. To this are added the plans which have just been announced for the construction of housing for Soviet immigrants in the Palestinian section of that city, which run counter to commitments under U.S. credit terms.

In other words, you form the impression here that Israel seems to be provoking the United States by displaying a total reluctance to consider the will and interests of its patron and thus playing into the hand of the Baghdad regime. Tel Aviv's arrogance has therefore generated powerful U.S. resistance. Talking with journalists on board his aircraft, President Bush stated: "We would like to see the UN resolution fulfilled in its entirety. We took part in its elaboration and we believe that it is the correct step." State Department spokesman M. Tutwiler was even tougher in her expression: "We are disappointed that the Israeli Government has decided not to cooperate with the UN commission." It has become known that Secretary of State Baker sent a personal message at the end of last week to Israeli Foreign Minister D. Levi appealing to him to receive the UN commission. This message was couched in the clearest possible terms. "I want to stress that if you reject the Security Council resolution some people will compare you, albeit unfairly, with Saddam Husayn and his refusal to recognize Security Council resolutions," the secretary of state wrote in particular.

U.S.-Israeli antagonism can hardly be called a "turning point," as some journalists here are doing. But I think that Washington is beginning to understand increasingly clearly the hopelessness of one-sidedness in foreign policy.

Exchange of Ministers With Iran Fosters Ties

NC2010140390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The visit to the Soviet Union by Mr. Mohammad Sa'idi-kia, the Iranian minister for roads and transportation, was followed by a visit by Mohsen Nurbakhsh, the Iranian minister for economic affairs and finance. They participated in sessions of the joint Soviet-Iranian economic commissions.

The Iranian guests' visits to the Soviet Union infused new strength in the trend toward the attainment of the long-term program for Soviet-Iranian commercial, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation envisaged up to the year 2000. As we know, an agreement was formulated last summer during Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to the Soviet Union. This agreement was viewed as a hopeful basis for fostering Soviet-Iranian goodneigborliness.

Our respective countries laid these foundations at a very momentous juncture in their lives, the era of political and economic restructuring in the Soviet Union and Iran. In the Soviet Union, a transition from the bureaucratic command over the economy to a free market economy is in progress. In the Soviet republics, the fundamental restructuring of the economy is envisioned. In Iran as well, efforts are being made to make the economy healthier and more liberal, and to increase the competitive quality of Iranian products on the international market.

Soviet-Iranian cooperation yielded important results this year. In the spring, Iran initiated gas exports via the Soviet Union. The residents of the Soviet Transcaucasus thus gained a valuable source of fuel, which was necessary for them under the difficult conditions national conflicts created in the region. Iran also links its postwar reconstruction programs to boosting its gas exports. Soviet-Iranian agreements on gas are a superb example of amicable coexistence between various governments in an era of variegated social systems and diverse ideologies.

However, solely from the economic point of view, the importance of the above accord extends beyond the framework of the two countries. The representatives of the Soviet Union and Iran also discussed exporting Iranian gas by transiting the Soviet Union. Solving this issue will help to fulfill the East European countries' energy requirements to a considerable extent. These countries are in dire need of Iranian oil and gas because of the Persian Gulf crisis.

The Iranian guests' recent visits to the Soviet Union is evidence of the increasing dynamic fervor which marks the bilateral economic and commercial ties. Talks with the Soviet leaders and experts opened up immense possibilities for cooperation. The dissemination of a report on the signing of an agreement on the technical project Mashhad-Sarakhs and joint collaboration on the project's construction was instrumental in inspiring a special interest in Soviet social circles. The completion of this program will expand and strengthen Iran's transport links with Soviet Central Asian regions.

It may be noted that the first round of talks between Mr. Mohsen Nurbakhsh and the chairman of the Soviet-Iranian joint economic commission was held in Baku. Of course, this is not merely a coincidence. In the years of restructuring, the ties between Iran and Soviet Azerbaijan have become closer and more diverse. The liberal regime in the border regions of Soviet Azerbaijan and Iran has proved favorable for the bolstering the quantum of commercial exchanges in general. During their stay in the Soviet Azerbaijani capital, the Iranian guests met with Gasan Gasanov, the head of the Azerbaijan SSR government and discussed joint investment, joint banking, boosting of cargo transport by marine, rail and road transportation, and the expansion of mutual television links.

Mohsen Nurbakhsh attended the international trade congress in Baku, in which guests from 40 countries participated. During his speech at the congress, he stressed the positive trend in Soviet-Iranian relations and their growth and progress. Economic and commercial cooperation is a strong basis for the goodneighborly relations between the Soviet Union and Iran, as well as a source of stability in the region—a region from which the clouds of tension have not yet been dispelled. It is hoped that this element of cooperation continues to becomes more fruitful.

Nishanov Praises Relations With India

LD2210165290 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Soviet Union has few partners like India, "relations with which have historically developed without set-backs, good to better," said Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of Nationalities chamber.

He was interviewed by TASS here before the arrival of a delegation from the Indian parliament led by Rabi Ray, speaker of its House of the People.

"Relations between the USSR and India are not only relations between the two countries' governments but, what is very important, between their peoples," Nishanov noted.

"The regular dialogue at the summit level leads to the development of comprehensive cooperation with India. This dialogue was highlighted by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visits to India in 1986 and 1988 and the major documents signed during those visits," he said.

"The Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh's recent visit to the Soviet Union confirmed the continuing personal contacts between the Indian and Soviet leadership.

"The joint Soviet-Indian statement signed during that visit was a worthy continuator of the Delhi Declaration. It emphasized the two countries' readiness to enter the 21st century on the basis of their common vision of world processes".

Regular contacts between the Soviet and Indian parliaments have become a tradition, Nishanov said. They "permit us to exchange legislative experience in solving political, social, economic, national and other problems and help us understand each other better".

Nishanov pointed out that if Soviet and Indian parliamentarians agreed to act in solidarity in the international arena, they could produce tangible results in the struggle for a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests and facilitate turning the Asian-Pacific region into a zone of peace, security and cooperation.

"We believe that it would be a good idea for Soviet and Indian parliamentarians to hold jointly a representative conference of parliamentarians of the Asian and Pacific countries to consider the region's pressing problems," Nishanov said.

"A forum of this kind could discuss the settlement of regional conflicts, including in the Middle East," the Soviet statesman said.

Nishanov said that Soviet-Indian economic cooperation was mutually advantageous. According to him, in 1989, the Soviet Union imported from India one billion roubles worth of consumer goods, and the plank will be raised this year.

Both traditional Indian exports to the Soviet Union and new industrial products—including machines, electronic and medical equipment, computers and medicines—are increasing.

The total volume of Soviet-Indian trade has been consistently on the rise, reaching 2.8 billion roubles in 1989.

Nishanov favoured developing new forms of Soviet-Indian interaction, including production cooperation, joint ventures and building cooperation in the Soviet Union and third countries.

He said a powerful impulse to further economic interaction will be provided by new summit agreements on the development of bilateral relations up to the end of the century.

Drop in Oil Prices Curtails Trade With Morocco

91UF0055A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent S. Filatov: "Are You Loading Oranges?"]

[Text] Many of our readers might remember oranges that were selling in our stores some years ago; they had small, diamond-shaped stickers on them saying "Morocco." Later they disappeared. "Why?" I asked Yu. Tikhonov, USSR trade representative in Morocco.

"In spite of the current intergovernmental commitments to purchase 75 to 120 thousand tons of citrus fruits a year here, in 1988 the Soviet side was ordered to stop buying those very oranges altogether. (Now we do not import oranges from anywhere at all—S. F.) Our organizations ceased to purchase olives, triple superphosphate, lead, fabrics, and some other products listed in the 1984 protocols. The planned volume of trade in those products, as outlined when the protocols were being signed, was not realized; on the contrary, it even fell in comparison with the previous level.

The immediate cause of this reduction in trade is the drop in world crude oil prices; oil is the main item of our export here (the jump in prices of recent months evidently did not noticeably affect the situation here—S.F.). And the main reason is an absolute refusal by Soviet agencies to honor agreements with respect to any imports—there is no money. Our trade with Morocco actually became somewhat unilateral: Exports of raw materials, machines, and some industrial products from the USSR are considerably larger than our imports from Morocco. The total trade turnover in 1989 was 80.7 million rubles. This causes certain dissatisfaction in local business circles.

It is true that the hard-currency situation in our country is very difficult. But there seem to be no reasons to stop looking for possibilities for direct business relations.

I was told about such in Moscow by I. Grizanov, the Soviet executive secretary on the permanent intergovernmental Soviet-Moroccan Commission for Economic, Technical, and Scientific Cooperation. According to him, the commission possesses the pertinent information on potential trade partners in Morocco. Our enterprises and organizations interested in direct links with this country can address the commission for help.

We have to confess that the attention of our foreign trade officials is turned mostly to the developed industrial countries. They tend to forget about other partners, African, for instance, and sometimes ruin even the established links there. But we should trade with this continent also. The West, by the way, regularly receives many goods from this continent.

East Europe

Last Soviet Helicopter Regiment Leaves CSFR

LD2310083790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent A. Samylin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Siliac military air base in central Slovakia has on more than one occasion been criticized by the Czechoslovak public. The residents of nearby towns and villages complained about the loud noise. There were also accidents and instances of environmental pollution. There are large fuel storage tanks here, which are now being dismantled.

Today the last Soviet helicopter regiment left Czechoslovakia from this military base. It consisted of 59 combat aircraft. There is a special commission at the CSFR parliament to monitor the troop withdrawal, chaired by Michael Kocab. He is pleased at the way the withdrawal of the Soviet units is going: everything is according to schedule, and even ahead of it. Relations are correct and friendly. The path to these relations was a difficult one but, in this case, we have proven in actions that we know how to keep our word.

As I found out from a conversation with Soviet military spokesmen, it is not always yet possible to determine precisely the scale of the damage caused. Moreover, many of our garrisons were located at former Czechoslovak bases. So experts from both countries are investigating what is whose fault, and where. But the main thing remains that it has possible to set up normal cooperation—that there is a mutual interest in putting the final full stop to the sadly well known events of August 1968.

Yakovlev Addresses Forum on East Europe

LD2010204690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 20 Oct (TASS)—Democratic changes in the countries of Eastern Europe are closely connected with processes of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. This thought has been stressed at the international theoretical conference on Transformations in East Europe: the View from the Left. Prominent Soviet and foreign political experts and economists from most European countries took part in it.

The examination of issues connected with the changes in the position of leftwing movements in the states of the region, in the light of the recent historic social and political changes, was the aim of this authoritative forum.

A.N. Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council, addressed conference participants.

He said: It may perhaps be a paradox but for those living through it, the present day is almost incomprehensible by precise analysis when it is a question of events, changes, and advances of social historical scale and significance. Something always escapes, the object under study emanates problems which reject the truths of yesterday and are higly vulnerable to threats from new dogmas. And only the historical standards of analysis are of any use in order to see and assess the range of choice, to understand its meaning, and to sense what lies ahead.

With reference to the process in Eastern Europe this is all the more the case. The place of this area in European and world history, in the history of the socialist idea and practice, in the international and inter state relations of our own day and the foreseeable future, is too specific.

The order which existed in Eastern Europe for a little less than half a century and which today is undergoing dramatic changes drew a line under a lengthy, strained and, at bottom, violent period of European development. It was that period when, beginning as long ago as the Congress of Vienna and the days of the Holy Alliance, the most reactionary and the most progressive tendencies in social development of their day intertwined and clashed precisely in Eastern Europe. There were the most authoritarian regimes, the most inert and reactionary monarchies, the most impenetrable barriers between the estates, and the most glaring social contracts on the one hand. But, precisely because of this, it was the most receptive soil for all that the 19th and 20th centuries entailed, for the ideas of humanism, democracy, equality, progress, liberty, and enligtenment, but also for the negation of anarchy and destruction by the dispossessed.

Essentially since the 1830's the entire cultural, moral, and indeed daily life of Eastern Europe, from which I in no way separate Russia and the Soviet Union, has unfolded under the dominant influence of the massive, previously unprecedented struggle between quintessential European reaction and quintessential European progressiveness in all its forms and manifestations, cultural, ideological, theoretical, social, and political.

He went on to note that 150 years of development were based on self-determination of the peoples and social and national liberation, the collapse of despotism, and the beginnings of democratic reform. The continuation and consolidation of the cultural foundations laid in ancient times throughout civilization and throughout Europe are a generally recognised contribution to the development of the world.

I am convinced, he continued, that it is against this background that one should view the current changes in Eastern Europe. Yes, the changes are dramatic and at the moment difficult to predict in many respects. Yes, they do contain not only the seeds of renewal but also social antagonism, hostility, and intolerance—those perpetual grave diggers of mankind. Yes, politically these changes have struck—in some cases very painfully—at much of what seemed only yesterday to be sacred. Yes, the forces of conservatism and present-day reaction have been given a unique opportunity to sing the swansong of the socialist idea itself.

The questions are logical. Life itself demands answers. The key words in the search for these answers are to be found in the phrase "the view from the left"—provided, of course, that one does not fall back on uncritical prescriptions and formulas. I believe the initiators and organizers of the conference have chosen a very appropriate lens through which to view such a complex, emotional, and politically "charged" set of problems.

Throughout history the concept of "the left" in political and ideological parlance has been correctly linked with those who have striven to further social progress and to consolidate and develop humanistic principles both in the individual and in society, the speaker stressed.

The question: where are the changes now taking place in the historical scale of time and evaluations leading: is that a step forward or a deviation, a thrusting back? is a central one for left-wing forces, for the left of the future.

Let us take a look at what has happened from the point of view of what door it objectively opens.

The real, practical right of the peoples to self-determination has strengthened, both in each state of Eastern Europe and in the USSR. There is a great deal of haste and confusion in this process now, and conflicts break out. But one should not consider the awakened consciousness and activity of the peoples to be a negative factor. And from this point of view, changes are taking place in the active members of the leftwing socio-historical tendency, of left-wing forces. These changes are a new link, a new stage in the development of social and national liberation, the emancipation of peoples and of man. That field potentially is also for the left. But not automatically and not invariably. The acquired space of freedom is to be filled with creative work. Otherwise, the growing freedom may also be turned to evil; but it is not freedom that will be guilty of such a turn of events.

The long historical line of the failure of authoritarian and particularly of totalitarian forms of government, the line of the historical growth of the democratic process is continued. Of course, the question of how we deal with democracy, of what we turn its possibilities to, is topical here, too.

A powerful blow has been dealt to militarism and violence and, moreover, not only at the regional level, but more widely. The restriction and reduction of armed forces and weapons, the removal from the continent of the danger of war and the gradual "drawing in" of troops that has begun to within their national frontiers are not only political normalization, material economizing, and the overcoming of obstructions which remain from the cold war. All this, and it is here in my opinion that the most important thing lies, will, in the historical perspective, put all the European states into normal conditions of domestic development and foreign cooperation, into conditions that are not extreme, distorted or perverted by artificial passions, invented or deliberately cultivated dangers or the psychology of violent thought and conduct. The conditions that came into being 150-200 years ago for only certain countries of Europe, those that were most successful, can prevail for the continent as a whole. Whether this is a victory for the outlook of the left or a defeat is a rhetorical question, A.N. Yakovlev said.

The line and tradition of all-European culture have also won powerful support. It must not be forgotten that from its very inception, the socialist idea has been entirely in line with the humanist, cultural, and political traditions of Europe. In this sense, too, the solution that can be collectively felt through perestroyka in the USSR and the changes in other Eastern European countries is a solution not only for these peoples. In the long term, and you will forgive me for the forecast, it is not even so much for ourselves.

I am convinced that with the start of changes in Eastern Europe, the historical prospects for the left alternative are expanding considerably. In the short-term this means a difficult, tortuous, dramatic, and potentially dangerous crisis of development. In the medium term it means the inevitability of a complex search, difficult work, and a review of all that life has rejected or which has worn itself out. In the long term, however, it means the opening up of new horizons, the acquisition of new possibilities for the historical tendency of the left and for the social forces that are its bearer and expression.

The socialist idea, newly freed from the oppressive, numbing, crushing weight of the command bureaucracy system, has every possibility of taking on a new content and new essence and of making an honorable match with real life, he pointed out.

A new Europe is being born. This really is the case. Confrontation is receding, along with the psychology of a kind of "all-European civil war". In these circumstances the socialist idea is capable of giving the peoples of Europe a great deal. But, it stands to reason, an idea filled with up-to-date contents. An idea that is implemented as the result of the democratic creativity of the peoples themselves, which takes into account and makes use of all the experience Europe has amassed of subordinating all social and state structures to the needs of a specific individual. Not an all-destroying mythology but practical construction, reflecting the will of the peoples.

I risk showing "the wrong spirit" but I am profoundly convinced that all-embracing nihilism regarding all that is socialist is no less harmful and dangerous than an equally all-embracing self-glorification and self-admiration. It is not emotions that are required but knowledge of the way things really are, the real progress of processes, their inner motives and workings. This is a fundamental and very practical question. Only when they have answered it will the left arrive at the revival of the socialist idea, which I am sure is inevitable and not so very far away, although it would be deceiving oneself to expect such a revival tomorrow.

It is the socialist idea that has brought Europe out of the state with which it met the 20th Century. It was not the socialist idea that was responsible for two world wars, that have produced their tragic effect on the fate of Europe. And I am convinced that we will be able to sort out all the events and reasons for them happening in the past, that we will be able to do away with the crust that has left its destructive effect on the high and romantic spirit of human hopes. I am convinced that we will be able to adopt and implement in life the strategy of genuine left forces—the strategy of the priority of a human being, its life, its cares and worries, its real values and highest esteems—all this was underlined at the end of his report by the member of the USSR Presidential Council.

Scientists conducted a lively discussion during two days in the conference hall at the Institute of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU, with the center of attention focused on the economic, social, and political processes in Eastern Europe and on the perspectives of the development of the left movement in the countries of the region.

Sociologists got acquainted with each other's opinions and expressed their own views on these problems. It was noted that the Eastern European forces of the left were not ready for the rapid events of recent years. Due to a number of mistakes and distortions they lost their authority, they failed to retain power and to keep their positions.

That is why there arose a necessity for a profound analysis of the reasons of such events, for the reassessment of the tactics and the strategies of the left movements in the modern world. It was noted at the conference that such meetings of political experts of different countries should help in the forward development of the theory and practices of the left movements.

Lukyanov Meets Bulgarian Assembly Leader

LD2210214690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Comrade Lukyanov meet in the Kremlin with Academician Todorov, chairman of the Bulgarian National Assembly, who is in Moscow. The further development of Soviet-Bulgarian relations in the light of new realities in both countries were discussed.

Central Committee's Vlasov Visits Bulgaria

PM1910145090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit to Bulgaria"]

[Text] A.V. Vlasov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department, paid a working visit to Bulgaria 16-18 October at the invitation of the leadership of the BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party]. He had meetings with A. Lilov, chairman of the BSP Higher Council Presidium; A. Tomov, D. Yonchev, and L. Kyuchukov, deputy heads of the party; the aktiv of the BSP's Sofia organization; and also with P. Beron, chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Union of Democratic Forces, and other party and state figures.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Vienna Talks

LD2110213490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1750 GMT 21 Oct 90

[Interview with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Soviet journalists on board a plane flying back to Moscow from Vienna on 18 October; introduced by correspondent B. Kostenko—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent B. Kostenko] Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, was here [in Vienna] on a brief working visit. On Thursday, 18 October, he met French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. At the center of the agenda were questions connected with the forthcoming two-day working visit by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Paris, and his talks with French President Francois Mitterrand. This visit will be an important element in strengthening bilateral relations and will certainly be an event of world importance.

During their talks in the Austrian capital, the foreign ministers of the USSR and France also discussed the situation in the Persian Gulf and the course of the Vienna talks in preparing a draft treaty on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe. The talks took place in the Soviet Embassy in Vienna.

Comrade Shevardnadze gave an interview to Soviet journalists as he returned to Moscow.

[Shevardnadze] The importance of today's meeting is that we will sign a new treaty. Again, it is the European problem that I would put at the forefront. After all, we are speaking of a truly new Europe, of new relations, of new principles, of a new disposition of forces, and the final overcoming of confrontation and opposition—the military standoff. And here I want to stress in particular the significance of the document that will be signed, and which will certainly become the basis for new relations between the Soviet Union and France, precisely in the general European context, the general European context.

When we speak of a new Europe, this is a common proof of this common European home of ours, or, as French political language says, the confederation. It means a common declaration, common consultation, common obligations, a common political climate that is suitable, necessary, and essential for every country; and this is a common political atmosphere that is being asserted and is being strengthened by bilateral relations, by bilateral obligations.

What we are doing with the united Germany, with France, Britain, Italy, Spain, and the other European states in the sense of establishing common European security structures, I think we are working for the Union, for Russia, for the Ukraine, for the Baltic, for everyone. This confirms civilized relations between states, and we are removing the military threat; we are removing military confrontations. And this is in everyone's interests, after all.

How these processes will proceed inside the country is another question. I think that without our new foreign policy, it may not be modest to talk of this now, but just imagine what difficulties we would have come up against inside the country politically if we did not have a certain mutual understanding with the Western powers, the United States, France, FRG, and other countries—Britain and so on.

Apart from everything else, let us just count up how much we are now getting in material support. This is all an advance. They could give just nothing at all, by the way. And credits, the most favourable conditions, the most favourable conditions. They are all helping; they are all supporting us. Why are they supporting us? Because, in the final resort, we have become civilized people in the field of foreign policy. They are supporting us because they are not afraid of us. We have gotten rid of this fear. As Andreotti once said: We used to be afraid of you, and now we are not afraid of you. We have started to trust you. Why was the president awarded the Nobel prize? Because they trusted him. It is a recognition of the new policy, of new thinking, of the principles of the new thinking.

[Reporter] Your latest speech in the USSR Supreme Soviet aroused a certain amount of criticism, especially from military deputies. How does the work of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs fit in with the military department, from the point of view of the process of arms reductions talks and so on?

[Shevardnadze] You know, these talks are a very complex process—it truly is a process—particularly when we are talking about such a sensitive sphere a defense and security, arms reduction. It is very difficult for all of us to part with these weapons. They are our potential, that is how we regarded them, and still do, the military potential, the defense potential of the country. When we are conducting talks, when we speak of real agreements and overcoming military confrontation, we certainly have to take into account the interests of our partners; where their interests are, that is to say, what they are interested in, and what we are interested in. When we come to a balance, reach a balance of interests, and take each other's interests into account, then we can manage to agree.

[Reporter] Tell us, Eduard Amvrosiyevich, what is the greatest obstacle today for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

[Shevardnadze] Internal instability. Internal instability. That is the greatest obstacle today. As for the rest, we shall argue, and as for talks, so to say, we shall find solutions. We shall be guided by the country's highest interests and those of each people, of each republic. I am certain that the world really is warming up for important decisions, so to say. There will be order in the Near East, and in the Persian Gulf, if the country does not let us down.

Reports Continue on Luxembourg Premier's Visit

Talks With Gorbachev Viewed

LD2210191690 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev met Prime Minister Jacques Santer of Luxembourg in the Kremlin today. This meeting is another positive example of relations between the two countries, which are invariably marked by mutual respect and goodwill.

Santer congratulated Gorbachev on being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. He said that this award attested to the "recognition by the world community of the Soviet leader's role in affirming new principles in international relations."

Gorbachev thanked Santer for the congratulations and said that he thinks the Nobel committee's decision reflects "understanding of what perestroyka means to our country and the whole world."

Gorbachev and Santer focused on European problems. They noted with satisfaction that relations between Europeans have entered a new epoch.

This epoch is characterised by the growing interdependence of states and their desire to work out jointly structures corresponding to changes in politics, security and other areas.

The two leaders agreed that November's Paris summit of countries participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe should give a powerful impetus to these positive changes.

Gorbachev emphasised the "huge historical experience accumulated by Europeans, the intellectual and moral potential of Europe and its influence on the renewal of world politics."

He spoke about "energetic measures, being taken now, to stabilise the economy and ensure the transition to a market economy."

He said these measures "are opening broad vistas for international cooperation."

Santar supported this idea. He said Luxembourg, which will chair the European Communities from next January, was interested in promoting cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EEC.

Gorbachev and Santer pointed to the favourable development of Soviet-Luxembourg relations.

Santer invited Gorbachev to visit Luxembourg. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Ryzhkov Makes Dinner Speech

LD2210214190 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—A road to achieving a common Europe lies through a joint search for its optimum model and through a political dialogue to summarise all productive proposals, Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov said here today.

He spoke at a dinner given on behalf of the Soviet Government in honour of Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer. He arrived in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

The forthcoming summit in Paris is an important stage in strengthening positive trends in Europe's political development, Ryzhkov continued.

"Our experts are completing in Vienna the drafting of a major agreement on cuts in conventional weapons, which will help bring down the level of Europe's oversaturation with weapons.

"We hope that it will be possible at the forum to formalise in documents the new quality of relations between the states of the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Alliance."

The Soviet Union also values the emerging turn to political cooperation with the European Community, the largest integration structure in Europe, to the participation in which Luxembourg is traditionally loyal, Ryzhkov continued.

"Indicative in this respect is our recent joint statement on the Gulf conflict, which has become an important element of the world community's unity in condemning this act of aggression.

"We attach special importance to economic cooperation with the European Community, regarding this cooperation the establishment of a foundation for European construction," the prime minister said.

Pursuing the policy for sweeping changes within the socialist choice, the Soviet Union will responsibly fulfil its obligations to the international community, Ryzhkov stressed.

Santer noted in his reply speech that the dialogue conducted over the last few months removed any idea of not only confrontation from Soviet-Luxembourg relations but also fruitless ideological disputes.

The Soviet policy of renewal, democratisation and glasnost has opened new prospects in relations between the two countries.

The USSR created conditions which enabled Central European peoples to regain their dignity over the past ten months, he said.

The break-off from the past and the innovative policy accompanying this break-off confirm Luxembourg's conviction that true peace cannot be established without freedom.

The recent decision to award the Nobel Peace Prize to President Gorbachev is the recognition by the international community of the high appraisal of this policy, Santer stressed.

The new areas of the Soviet international policy have found their reflection in disarmament, he noted. Specific prospects for substantial cuts have now emerged. As a result, Armed Forces will have only defensive structure.

The elimination of redundant weapons in Central Europe, the end of Germany's division and solidarity displayed in the Gulf crisis are an expression of the Soviet Government's respect for the rules of international law and its high feeling of responsibility, Santer emphasised.

This new solidarity will ensure a sound basis to create conditions, at least in Europe, for normal and common existence, conditions which have always been absent. The time has possibly come to create appropriate joint structures, the prime minister noted.

It seems that after the 15 years of signing the final act in Helsinki, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is turning into a forum which meets various requirements most of all, he continued.

A meeting to be held in Moscow next year will undoubtedly help ensure basic human rights even more, Santer stressed.

Culture Minister Notes Agreement

LD2210142190 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Lyudmila Shvedova and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The programme for cultural and scientific cooperation between the Soviet Union and Luxembourg in 1991 and 1992, signed in the Kremlin today, aims to develop favourable tendencies in these fields and envisages the expanison of cultural exchanges.

The programme envisages, for the first time, the development of direct contacts between Luxemburg and individual Soviet republics.

Soviet Culture Minister Nikolay Gubenko told TASS that Luxemburg is "one of the world's cultural crossroads and one of the common market capitals that is enmeshed in the spiritual and moral fibres of European culture".

The minister recalled that during his visit to Strasbourg, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev suggested creating a European Universtity of Culture, with Luxemburg as the centre.

"The programme signed today," Gubenko said, "is aimed at implementing this initiative. The decision to establish such a university has not yet been made, but I know that the Luxemburg side is eager".

The minister stressed that the programme contains some general provisions along with very specific ones, relating to the exchange of students, research fellows and artists.

The ceremonial signing of the programme was attended by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and visiting Prime Minister Jacques Santer of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg.

Moiseyev To Visit Belgium, NATO Headquarters

LD2210174590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—It was officially reported here today that Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR and chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, will visit Belgium on 24 October at the invitation of Lieutenant General J. Charlier, chief of general staff of the Armed Forces of Belgium.

On 25-26 October he will visit NATO Headquarters in Brussels at the invitation of General V. Eide, chairman of the NATO military committee, and the Headquarters of the Supreme Allied Powers in Europe at the invitation of J. Galvin.

Sitaryan, European Community Leaders Meet

LD2310075590 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Brussels October 23 TASS—The broadening of cooperation between the European Communities and the Soviet Union were discussed during talks here between Soviet and EC delegations.

Stepan Sitaryan, soviet deputy prime minister and chairman of the government's State Foreign Economic Commission, led the Soviet side, while Jacques Delors, president of the Commission of European Communities (CEC) headed the EC team. CEC members who are in charge of foreign and economic relations and the power industry also took part in the talks which ended on Monday.

The sides discussed prospects for the development of contacts between them in the light of the Soviet Parliament's endorsement of a market economy plan and the CEC-prepared report on the state of the Soviet economy and possibilities to render aid to the Soviet Union.

The report will be submitted for consideration to the heads of state and government of common market countries at their meeting at the end of October.

Soviet Science Festival Opens in Austria

Ryzhkov Sends Message

LD2210212590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, 22 Oct (TASS)—The main tasks of the days of Soviet Science and Technology in Austria which have opened here and will last until 28 October is to better acquaint Austrians with the USSR's scientific-technological achievements and to discuss specific areas for further development of mutually beneficial cooperation.

A Soviet delegation headed by Nikolay Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Science Committee, has arrived in Vienna to participate. He will meet with Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky, and will have talks with representatives of business circles.

Greetings from Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, were read out at the opening ceremony of the Days, in which he emphasizes that the Soviet Union sincerely desires to build its relations with foreign countries on the basis of cooperation and neighborliness, and to look for ways for joint resolution of mankind's global problems. The radical changes in the social and economic life of the USSR which are taking place, the message says, create a favorable foundation for expanded cooperation between Soviet and Austrian organizations and enterprises in the economic and scientific and technological spheres.

Scientists Present Technology

AU2210220090 Vienna Television Service in German 2100 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Report by Walter Richard Langer]

[Text] A high-ranking delegation of Soviet scientists is currently on a visit to Vienna. It has come to Austria because the latest Soviet achievements in the sphere of science and technology are being presented for the first time at an international fair, the World Tech Vienna 90. At the same time, the Soviet delegation wants to establish contacts with Austrian institutions and enterprises, and initiate joint projects.

On the basis of the slogan, come to Mir, Science Minister Busek received the Soviet delegation today. The delegation that wants to find Western purchasers for the Soviet Union's latest high technology products presents over 1,000 exhibits and advanced technologies, such as a unique aluminum welding process. It was applied in the construction of the Mir space station and of the fully operative 1:1 model, which will be the main attraction of the Vienna fair.

These pictures [showing booster rockets] were taken at the (Konishep) Works near Moscow, the largest rocket producing factory in the Soviet Union, which was so far closed to Western journalists. Now they are for the first time allowed to take photographs in the assembly halls where satellites, space stations, and booster rockets are being produced. The Soviets hope to sell their space technology on international markets. They offer the transportation of European and U.S. satellites to space. The high-efficiency proton rockets are to be used as booster rockets. The negative attitude of the United States has so far prevented the successful conclusion of such deals. Still, the Soviet Union hopes to sell more high technology in the West which has been tested in space.

TASS Interviews Cypriot President on Ties

LD1710192690 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 17 Oct 90

[By special TASS correspondents Vladimir Korochantsev and Yegor Uvarov]

[Text] Nicosia October 17 TASS—President of the Republic of Cyprus Mr. Yeoryios Vasiliou gave an interview to TASS. He said that perestroyka in the Soviet Union has revolutionised international relations. "It has put an end to the cold war and has given rise to a new spirit of cooperation between states and a willingness to solve outstanding regional problems. This has enabled progress to be made on many issues. The Cyprus problem itself was brought up and discussed at the last superpower summit and hopefully this trend will continue," Vasiliou said.

"Perestroyka in my view has been and is the most important political event since World War II. Its beneficial effects are obvious and apparent everywhere. Perestroyka has revolutionised the Soviet system. It is obvious that a society that is going through such a radical transformation has to face difficulties. But the transformation, everybody agrees, is necessary and at the end of the day the benefits will be much higher for everyone than the difficulties now faced," Vasiliou said.

Vasiliou dwelt at length on the Cyprus problem. He noted the government's resolve to continue the search for its settlement by a peaceful dialogue. He said that the essence of the Cyprus problem is that it is a case of the invasion of one sovereign state by another. Sixteen years ago Turkey invaded and took control of almost a third of the island and despite repeated United Nations calls for her to withdraw still remains.

"A settlement of the problem lies within the framework of the two high level agreements that were reached in 1977 and 1979 and provide for a demilitarised, united Cyprus under a federal roof," the president said. "The Greek Cypriot side has submitted proposals towards such a federal salution that would safeguard the concerns and interests of both communists on the island," the president said.

"Despite having met with constant intransigence from the Turkish side, the Cyprus Government will continue its search for peace and for a just and lasting settlement of the problem," the president said.

Vasiliou said that the Gorbachev-Bush Helsinki meeting had yielded encouraging results. "The determination of the leaders of the two superpowers not to accept invasion as a fait accompli is a significant event in itself, but more important still is their decision to work together after the Gulf crisis is over, in order to establish a system of peace and security in the region and to solve regional problems," he said.

"In this respect I personally wrote to congratulate the two leaders on their effort and to offer Cyprus' support and cooperation in this field," Vasiliou said.

"Over the last 30 years Cyprus has transformed itself from a mainly agricultural and underdeveloped economy, largely dependent on unstable external factors such as exports of minerals and the military expenditure of the colonial government, into a competitive export-oriented economy based on a broad specrum, of activities covering all economic sectors, such as tourism, professional and other services, industry and agriculture," he said.

The president said that today Cyprus has a per capita income of 9,500 dollars and a rate of growth exceeding five percent, with virtually no unemployment and with a low level of inflation.

"I believe the 'secret' of this economic miracle lies in the industriousness and resourcefulness of our people and in the resolve not to bow under the weight of the catastrophe that befell them," Vasilious said.

"This was evident in the readiness with which they accepted the lowering of their wages, agreed to work longer hours, and undertook to search the world over for new markets for Cyprus goods. The industriousness and entrepreneurial spirit of the Cypriots was able to express itself because of the characteristics of our economy," Vasiliou said.

"We have a free market system operating without constraints or excessive protection but guided by our indicative five year plan. Furthermore, I should point out the fact that in Cyprus we have no monopolies while most industrial enterprises are of small or medium size with an export orientation. Our farmers—all small scale producers—are supported by a strong cooperative movement specialising in trading and finance," Vasiliou said.

Gorbachev Congratulates Cypriot Party Chairman

LD1910180890 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 19 Oct 90

["USSR's Contribution to United Europe—TASS Comment"—TASS headline; by TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent a telegram to Dimitris Christofias, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL), on his re-election to the post.

The telegram, issued here today, wished Christofias and all communists of Cyprus success in implementing decisions of the 17th AKEL Congress.

Gorbachev Names New Envoy to Cyprus

LD1910213190 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 19 TASS—The Soviet president has appointed Boris Zenkov to the post of Soviet ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus.

The new ambassador, born in 1946, graduated from the Moscow State Institute for International Relations. He joined diplomatic service in 1970 and worked in the ministry's central apparatus and Soviet embassies in Greece and Cyprus. Between 1985-1988 he was an aide to a Soviet deputy foreign minister.

From November 1988 to August 1990 he served as consul general in Casablanca, Morocco.

Yuriy Fokin was relieved of his duties as Soviet ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus in connection with the transfer to another job.

Protocol With Turkish Foreign Aides Signed

PM1710192590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Consultations in Ankara"]

[Text] Consultations between USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.M. Belonogov and Turkish First Deputy Foreign Minister T. Ozceri were held in Ankara 10 and 11 October.

The favorable and progressively developing nature of bilateral relations was noted with mutual satisfaction.

An in-depth exchange of opinions on topical international and regional problems, including the situation in the Mediterranean, took place.

Special attention was paid to the crisis situation in the Persian Gulf. The coincidence of the two countries' approaches to Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and their joint desire to overcome the crisis as quickly as possible were noted. In this regard the importance of the efforts made by the United Nations and the whole world community to bring about a peaceful political settlement of the crisis was pointed out.

A.M. Belonogov and T. Ozceri signed a protocol on political consultations between the USSR and Turkish Foreign Ministries which is designed to put the exchange of opinions on topical problems of bilateral cooperation and international relations on a regular footing.

The consultations were held in a businesslike and highly amicable atmosphere.

Supreme Soviets

Measures To Counter Speculation Approved 22 Oct

LD2210134790 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Soviet parliament today approved the first reading of a bill to toughen responsibility for wrongdoing in trading and for speculation and black-marketeering.

The bill, aiming to protect the consumer from foul play in domestic commerce, was presented by Valentina Semenko, secretary of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation.

She reminded deputies that a crackdown on black-marketeering was among the planks in the market reform platform adopted by the legislature on Friday.

She said that the bill would have time limits: "It will be applied during the economic stabilisation period."

Semenko explained the need for a hard line on black marketeers by citing "the unrestrained growth of speculative prices on consumer goods" on the domestic market.

Deputy Interior Minister Vasiliy Trushin blamed the increase in shady commercial deals on the continuing economic decline. He said that as of August 1, 1990, only 20, or 1.8 per cent, of the 1,100 basic goods were more or less readily available in the shops.

Trushin supported the bill as geared to stopping the more dangerous kinds of illegitimate wheeling and dealing, in particular large-scale black-marketeering.

Describing speculation as "the purchase of goods from state trading outlets and consumer cooperatives and their re-sale for profit," the bill makes it punishable by up to three years in jail, with the possible confiscation of property, or corrective labour for up to two years, or a fine of up to 5,000 roubles.

Large-scale black-marketeering, when illicit gains exceed 10,000 roubles, would be punished by between five and ten years behind bars and the confiscation of property.

During the debate, the bill's backers stressed the need to "teach people out of chasing a fast rouble." Critics predicted further price hikes on the black market.

The parliament is expected to take up a bill on railways in the afternoon.

Trushin Addresses Deputies on Speculation

LD2210230890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1840 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Remarks by Vasiliy Petrovich Trushin, USSR deputy interior minister, at 22 October session of USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] You know very well that there is probably nothing currently that so angers public consciousness as speculation. It has become one of the most widespread varieties of offense. They process of increasing the efforts of the law enforcement organs, and primarily the militia, in the fight against speculation and other forms of illegal commerce and abuse in the trade network is, unfortunately, yielding few results. Although nearly 270,000 persons who were engaged in illegal deals in buying up and reselling goods were apprehended as of 1 October—that is 47 percent more than last year—and more than 71,000—36 percent more—offenders against the trading rules, and goods and valuables worth more than 30 million rubles were been seized and confiscated from profiteers—just over twice as much as last year—this is an extremely insignificant proportion of the overall spiralling number of illegal deals in consumer goods stimulated by the continuing decline of the economy and fluctuating demand for many goods.

As things stood on 1 August this year, according to data from the institute for the study of the current economic situation and demand, only 20 kinds of goods were being sold more or less regularly—that is 1.8 per cent—of the 1,100 that were under observation. The flow of goods began to bypass the state retailers. Under these conditions the republics were compelled to toughen liability for abuse in the distribution sphere. Valentina Ivanovna [Semenko] has spoken about some of these measures. I would like to say that in February this year the Russian Federation, and then four more Union republics—Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Tajikistan—adopted a decree on intensifying administrative and criminial liability for abuse in the trade network and speculation. But there have been no serious, positive improvements since the acts in question, especially regarding speculation, made no provision for fundamental changes, and in general, merely boiled down to raising sanctions.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Rail Transport Bill

LD2210173190 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Boris Zverev, Ivan Ivanov, Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Soviet parliament today began to discuss a bill on railway transport that was submitted by First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin.

He said that the bill was intended to create legal, economic, and social prerequisites for stabilising the operation of railway transport and meet shipping requirements.

Voronin said that the total length of Soviet railways accounts for 12 per cent of the length of all railways in the world and that Soviet railway transport carries more than 50 per cent of the world's cargoes and more than 25 per cent of the world's passengers.

This industry "is crucial to the entire Soviet economy and serves to integrate regions and republics economically," he said.

The bill puts the management of railway transport "exclusively in the sphere of competence of the Soviet Union in the person of its bodies of power and administration."

Voronin said centralised management of railway transport is planned throughout the country. These functions will be performed by the Soviet Ministry of Railways.

The deputy prime minister pointed out that the bill for the first time makes railway transport responsible for losses due to traffic delays.

At the same time, "damages to railway transport as a result of beliberate blockades of railways will be paid by local government bodies according to the procedure established by law."

Valentin Tetenov, chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for Transport, Communications and Informatics, told parliament that "this is a major bill in a package of laws related to the country's transition to a market economy."

He emphasised that this transition would require "well-oiled transport support."

Other speakers, most of whom pointed to the poor state of Soviet railways, emphasised the need to toughen discipline in railway transport, to have the union, republican and local budgets contribute to its development and modernisation, and to prioritise the solution of railway transport problems.

The bill's discussion will continue on Tuesday.

Also today, deputies passed a resolution on last week's report to parliament by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Debates on Speculation, Railroads Outlined

LD2210203490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 22 October broadcasts a recording of the 22 October USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

The first part of the report is an examination of the bill on trading and speculation is shown in progress during the morning session. Semenko is shown outlining his reasons for submitting the bill. Semenko describes the aim of the bill—to protect the population from unwarranted price increases. He moves on to Article 9 of the government draft on speculation, proposing an addition to the text concerning the motivation and purpose of speculation, and proposes further additions to the government draft on behalf of the committee working group. Semenko refers to Article 5, which has been completely redefined by the committees and the working group on artificial price increases.

At 1853 GMT, Trushin is shown addressing the session on the evil of speculation and on the difficulty faced by the militia in combating speculation, citing figures and the failure of various measures to deal with the problem.

Yerokhin then cites the case of a group of Soviet officials who flew to the United States to commemorate Eisenhower's anniversary at great expense, which he calls a "feast during the plague." He proposes that the procuracy and the KGB investigate the case, and he links the case with the subject under discussion—official abuse.

Next, Nikolskiy speaks on abuses in the sphere of publishing.

At 1904 GMT, Burlatskiy says the main culprits are officials in the distribution network. He notes his preference for the government draft over the committee's proposed amended draft. Burlatskiy proposes the draft be returned to the committees for reworking.

Shapovalenko then takes the rostrum to make proposals amending the text of the bill.

At 1907 GMT, the announcer briefly summarizes the contributions by other deputies. Deputy Orlov is then shown addressing session, drawing attention to the fine line between speculation and free enterprise.

Levashev takes the rostrum and gives his views on the draft, saying the law will not work.

Golyakov next speaks on the subject of sanctions contained in the draft. He says they do not work as shown by practice and supports approval at the first reading.

At 1915 GMT, the announcer outlines some of the views expressed on whether to approve the bill at the first reading. He goes on to the draft resolution on the work of the Foreign Ministry as set out by Shevardnadze last week. Lukyanov says there will be an examination of the issue raised regarding the trip to the Eisenhower anniversary. At this point the morning session ends.

The recording then continues with the afternoon session. Voronin is shown speaking on the draft law on railways. He outlines the work of the railway industry, noting the new role the railways are taking on in the present conditions. Voronin notes the need for railway prices and tariffs to remain under all-Union control, and outlines three main types of tariffs which will be set. He goes on to the financing of the metropolitan.

Lukyanov then opens the floor for questions to Voronin. Questions are asked on financing, the allocation of responsibilities for railway construction, children's fares, increasing rolling stock, mechanisms for implementing the law, the rules of railway transport, and their possible abolition. Lukyanov points out that this must not be confused with the disciplinary rules. More questions follow on improving the railways in Kazakhstan and on the production of machinery for railways.

At 1935 GMT an unidentified deputy from the railroad commission addresses the session on the draft, discussion of which will continue tomorrow. The recording ends at 1940 GMT.

Supreme Soviet Issues Foreign Affairs Resolution

LD2210201990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1916 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—We are transmitting the USSR Supreme Soviet decision which has been circulated here today:

Resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the Current Moment in International Life and the Work of the USSR Ministry of Foreign affairs on Safegurding the Interests and Security of the Country:

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To take into account the report by Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, on the current moment in international life and the work of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on safeguarding the country's interests and security.

2. To instruct the USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs to continue consistent implementation of the political course, based on the principles of new thinking and active protection of the security and interests of the Soviet Union.

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs and the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of Defense and State Security, jointly with the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and USSR Defense Ministry, are to hold closed hearings with regard to the problems linked with safeguarding the country's security and with a subsequent examination of this issue at a sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

4. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Affairs of Internationalist Servicemen, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and State Security Issues are to have hearings in joint session, with representatives of the relevant ministries and departments invited, on the state of Soviet-Afghan relations and on efforts to settle as soon as possible the problems regarding Afghanistan. The results of this examination are to be reported to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

5. It is to be considered useful to extend the practice of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, other USSR Supreme Soviet committees and standing commissions of the chambers regularly presenting reports and briefings on the basic problems of foreign policy and efforts to resolve them to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
Moscow, the Kremlin, 22 October 1990

PRAVDA Cites Deputies' Reaction to Economic Plan

PM2010234390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Report by S. Oganyan and V. Shirokov: "USSR Supreme Soviet Session. The Choice Has Been Made"]

[Text] That is the title [reference to headline] of the first chapter of the "Basic Guidelines for the Stabilization of the National Economy and the Transition to a Market Economy" which have been discussed over the last few days at the country's Supreme Soviet. We decided to use the same five words to headline our report on the work of the Union legislature session yesterday.

The day's main event was the speech made by the country's president to deputies. (M.S. Gorbachev's speech is being published.) Readers can assess for themselves its substance, comparing the text of the speech with the situation in which the country has found itself. Assess the accuracy and honesty of his analysis of the prevailing situation. We only remind you that production volumes are falling, the consumer market is devastated... the budget deficit and the state's solvency have reached crisis level... separatism is increasing... and economic ties are breaking down.

Accordingly, it was to this problem—the problem of how to combine the scrappy threads—that the president's speech, which was outwardly quite restrained but full of internal tension, was devoted. All this was seen by deputies, journalists, and numerous guests against the fairly depressing backdrop of the just published USSR State Committee for Statistics report on the results of the work of the country's national economy for the first nine months of 1990.

The "spasms" of the dying administrative bureaucratic system will poison our life for a long time to come—until new incentives begin to work; until conditions are created encouraging enterprise and initiative; until complete freedom of economic activity and competition among producers—that is, the economic expanse also known as the market—is ensured.

But how far will the proposed Basic Guidelines help to stabilize the national economy? Will they be able to ensure the transition to truly market relations? Over the last few months deputies have been "seduced" by some projects—each of them radical in its own way, full of bold ideas—but they were all rejected. In this connection we remember the witty comment passed by one deputy the other day. He recalled the following parable: If two men have an apple each in their pockets, they will still have one apple if they exchange them. But if they exchange ideas, each would be one idea richer.... The deputy then added on his own account: If very many ideas are being bandied about in a country, it means the apple situation is bad in that country.... Every one of us is well aware that it is not only the apple situation that is bad in our country.

Now we have a new project. Will it be the definitive one? How acceptable is it to various groups of deputies? Will it bring the necessary change in the critical situation if it is adopted? The debates on the Basic Guidelines were heated but—let us point this out right away—constructive. As for the trenchancy of deputies' speeches, it came as no surprise to anyone and was seen as a normal element of parliamentary work. The debate showed that the document suits the majority. It was all particularly interesting to study deputies' comments both from the session rostrum and behind the scenes. What does Yu. Kalmykov, committee chairman, think of the proposed draft?

"I hardly think," he said, "that this draft will be the final one, which is not, moreover, what is required of it either. Its main merit resides in the fact that it contains the initial elements—and this is very important from the philosophical viewpoint—and life will make the requisite amendments. The draft's main idea is also acceptable—it is geared to giving the republics as much independence as possible."

The speech by Deputy G. Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, sounded somewhat dissonant against the backdrop of the discussion that unfolded, which was largely positive. He said that over the last three weeks Union organs had attacked the sovereignty of Russia insofar as they refuse to recognize the RSFSR bank, they are depriving it of hard-currency revenue, they have overburdened republic enterprises with the Union state order, and so on. In this connection opportunities for consolidation have been missed. However, he acknowledged that, whatever decision is adopted, an effective mechanism must be elaborated to implement it.

The same thought was voiced in other speeches. Moreover, N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who took the floor during the debate, stressed that the whole force of authority should be brought to bear to implement the plan. Only a strong and prestigious authority operating within the framework of the laws and only discipline in execution from top to bottom can ensure the program's implementation.

Nineteen people spoke during the debate. They were the representatives of highly diverse deputies' groups who voiced a most varied range of opinions, mainly backing the proposed program. It was decided to discuss the resolution on the question under discussion at the evening sitting.

Deputies' Remarks During Economic Debate Noted

PM2010235590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev and Captain Second Rank V. Urban: "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session. It Has Been Decided: We Are Heading Toward the Market"]

[Text] The result of the discussion of the Basic Guidelines for the Stabilization of the National Economy and the Transition to a Market Economy submitted by the USSR president is that the draft has been approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet. This occurred Friday at the parliament's evening sitting. What was the debate itself like?

Although more than 200 people had spoken the day before during committee and commission sittings, and most deputies had supported the Basic Guidelines, more than 30 people signed up to take part in the debate. Yet the document, A.I. Lukyanov stressed, is effectively being discussed on the third reading. We will not relate every speech; we will dwell on some of them briefly.

Deputy D.N. Kugultinov: While listening to M.S. Gorbachev's report I was comforted by the reference to autonomous republics and the reference to all peoples being equal.... I find a market economy acceptable because it is geared not to a group, not to a system, but to man.

Deputy Yu.V. Blokhin, representative of the Soyuz deputies' group: We suggest that the USSR president publish a package of decrees and instructions within a two-week period on the stabilization of the political situation in the country and the introduction of extraordinary measures in the economic sphere....

Deputy G.I. Filshin: I would like to inform you that over the last three weeks Union management organs have launched a massive attack on the rights and sovereignties which were adopted in the past by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and the Russian Congress of People's Deputies.

Deputy N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: In my view, this has not only turned out to be a unified but also a qualitatively new document. It has absorbed all the fundamental ideas contained in all the documents that have been discussed previously. The main thing is that these Basic Guidelines allow us to coordinate the actions of all republics and Union organs for the stabilization of the national economy and the transition to a market economy, they give every Union and autonomous republic extensive scope, and they allow them to formulate and implement specific measures in the light of specific local conditions.... Another point: It was one thing when Deputy Filshin was just a deputy and criticized everything. But it is quite another now that he is chairman of the Russian Gosplan [State Planning Commission]. Facts should not be juggled.

A group of RSFSR people's deputies attended the sitting. One of them—V.P. Lukin—had an opportunity to participate in the debate. In his opinion, the whole question is: Who will implement the program. The Russian deputy also broached B.N. Yeltsin's recent speech, attributing, in particular, the tone used by the chairman of the RSFSR legislature to alarm over the threat to the left-centrist coalition.

I seen no reasons for controversy, M.S. Gorbachev remarked in this connection. I invited those people who really support the country and perestroyka, who are prepared to act on this basis, to engage in consolidation, he said. The USSR president stressed that the main thing is that we reach accord with this document.

Some 19 deputies representing various republics, parliamentary commissions and committees, and deputies' groups spoke in the course of the discussion.

The debate was broken off at A.I. Lukyanov's suggestion. Deputies examined and adopted a draft resolution at the evening sitting.

Deputies rejected most of the amendments. Thus, the proposal put by the interregional deputies' group to omit the reference in the first part of the resolution to the Union government's participation in implementing the outlined measures for the transition to the market was rejected.

The USSR Supreme Soviet session will continue its work Monday.

Further Details on Academics' News Conference

PM2210133690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent V. Romanyuk: "'We Can Only Get Out of the Crisis by Working Together'"]

[Text] Three academicians who played an active part in elaborating the Basic Guidelines for the Stabilization of the Economy and the Transition to the Market—L. Abalkin, A. Aganbegyan, and S. Shatalin—have held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Summing up what our leading academics said, I would single out the main point—the emphasis on those facts and phenomena which testify to the increased consolidation of social forces. It is precisely this which will predetermine the success of the presidential program. Academician L. Abalkin reported that the previous day appreciable progress toward accord had been reached in the government with republic premiers participating. In particular, a decision was adopted to create a currency committee and, correspondingly, to centralize currency resources and jointly resolve questions relating to the acceptance of credits and their utilization in joint debt repayment. Incidentally, the biggest debt repayment will be made in 1991. Experience shows that purchasing imported raw materials is more beneficial on a Union-wide basis than if done by each individual republic.

One of the characteristics of the Basic Guidelines is that they are being adopted at a more difficult time than the option examined earlier. Academician S. Shatalin stressed that it is essential today to take account of a new reality—the 50-100 percent increase in prices on the market. "We sought to minimize the possibility of a bureaucratic increase in retail prices for basics," he stated. "The logic of the program has not changed, but the situation itself is different. And if the projected measures prove insufficient to eliminate the budget deficit, curb the money supply, and regularize foreign economic activity, additional measures will be taken."

Was a compromise made between two programs which, as was repeatedly stressed, were incompatible? In principle what we can see is a compromise solution. But the Basic Guidelines are in no way an obstacle to the 500 days program. What is important today is not even the program in itself, but the degree of agreement between republics. It is important that it has proved possible during the transition to the market to agree on a unified stringent budget and tax policy and on questions of the distribution of money flows and the labor market, privatization, and business activity. Yes, the president has decided on the administrative retention of enterprises' production links for a whole year. But the other programs also contained this same "antimarket" measure. The need to freeze these links will recede as the market comes to life.

Many people were curious about how much time will be needed to stabilize the economy—500 days or even 1,500? L. Abalkin expressed the view that as yet we are talking about creating the preconditions for the transition to a market and its infrastructure. Whereas the creation of an efficient economy will take at least decades and possibly the lifetime of an entire generation. The revolutionary breakthrough, A. Aganbegyan explained, will take one and one-half or two years. It is desirable to complete the formation of a consumer market by the end of 1991 by providing a more or less ample supply of goods. There must be a money and investment market by approximately the same time. Followed in the longer term by a manpower market (which will have to be preceded by a housing market, the removal of the residence-permit barrier, and so forth). The market is both a highly complex socioeconomic concept and simultaneously a process.

There were a number of questions about reducing the budget deficit. The Basic Guidelines contain this idea:

The deficit should be covered not by emission, as happened before, but through the issuing of securities and in general the reduction of the expenditure side of the budget (freezing construction projects, cutting expenditure on defense and on the maintenance of the state apparatus).

Much was said at the news conference about vertical relationships: between Union organs and republics. On the subject of B.N. Yeltsin's well-known remarks, Academician L. Abalkin stated that the interests of the cause should be placed higher than anyone's political ambitions; we must unite, despite critical attitudes to particular sections of the program. If you imagine that the president's decrees will be ratified by all the republics, chaos lies in store for the country, and ruin for the economy. The Russian Federation Council came out in favor of a vertical system of relations within the republic. But the same right should be guaranteed to the center too, on questions within its competence—finance, credit policy, bank interest rates.

Academician S. Shatalin stated that if we are to escape from the crisis, this can be done most effectively together, not separately. And the giant Russia cannot manage without little Moldova [Moldavia]. It is important for every republic's leaders to become clearly aware of the advantages of such an alliance to them.

And what about the defects of the new presidential program? They exist. But with its adoption, there is a far better chance of escaping from the crisis than before its adoption. It will, after all, be necessary to stabilize the economy, and this will be done, if only because the economy cannot exist for long in its present condition. The most gratifying thing, S. Shatalin noted, is that constructive trends are gradually gaining strength in the country and the first shoots of a political culture are growing stronger. It is important to engage more boldly in dialogue with all social movements and involve them in collective work on radical economic reform.

Committee Discussions on Economic Plan Detailed

PM1910134390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by E. Gonzalyez under the rubric "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions": "The Program Was Presented—Opinions Differ"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions, joined on a voluntary basis by members of some other committees and commissions, discussed the "Basic Guidelines for Stabilization of the National Economy and for Transition to a Market Economy."

The discussion began with brief reports by two representatives of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform—Ye. Yasin and B. Lisin.

B. Lisin spoke mainly about the problems of training cadres for work in the conditions of reform and market relations. The topic is so important that there is no point in presenting it in just one or two paragraphs. It evidently needs a special discussion. As a matter of fact, this is what the committee members decided: There is need for a special section on cadre training in the program for transition to the market. And they moved on to the "Basic Guidelines" themselves.

Yevgeniy Grigoryevich Yasin attempted to explain why the new version is so unlike a detailed program and is rather reminiscent of a fifty-fifty mixture of a political document and a protocol of intent. The main reason is this: Time and circumstances have changed. The debate on the two previous program alternatives lasted rather a long time, and much has changed in the economy meanwhile—and not for the better, alas.

Yasin's comment on the "Basic Guidelines" was most detailed when it came to price formation, the financial system's recovery, and measures for the social protection of those who need it. He admitted that the coupling of some solutions from the two program in the version was not always achieved without visible seams and patches. It is to be expected, however, that life will smooth and polish everything. The main point is that there is a foundation for transformation, and there has been enough discussion—it is time to act.

I have no intention of listing the specific questions asked of one of the compilers of the "Basic Guidelines" by Deputies V. Lisitskiy, V. Kabakov, V. Minayev, and others. Let me just mention that they all were aggressive and indicated a rather stormy discussion to come. And this is what happened.

Deputies P. Bunich, V. Tikhonov, Yu. Blokhin, A. Samsonov, N. Sazonov, and several others voiced their opinions on the latest version of the document. Numerous doubts were expressed on specific issues, numerous contradictions emerged. But the deputies' positions did not differ in minor details—it soon became obvious that they differed on one main point: their attitude toward the proposed document.

Some treated it with great animation, almost with enthusiasm. Some of its provisions did not seem too felicitous, but their overall response was to approve and adopt it. It was even proposed that this should be done at the Supreme Soviet without personal discussion—just on the basis of committees' and commissions' conclusions.

It was interesting that some deputies perceived the concept's merits where others had detected shortcomings. For example, they liked the fact that the "Basic Guidelines" have successfully avoided getting down to specific details. "Otherwise we would have been arguing for a long time to come," one of the deputies said. Furthermore, this approach leaves the president's and the USSR Supreme Soviet's hands free.

And right away another deputy described the declarative and vague nature of the "Basic Guidelines" as a shortcoming.

There were many statements to this effect, but I would not like to comment on them now, let alone categorize them. The deputies have yet to meet Academician A. Aganbegyan, the "foreman" of the compromise version, a meeting where much could be explained and even reversed. For the time being, it would be best to note not what divided the deputies but the points on which they all agreed.

The first premise, which is obvious to all: The country is fed up with waiting. They all agreed that voters will not forgive any further inaction. True enough, this also produced different conclusions. Some said that the voters will not forgive the Supreme Soviet if nothing is adopted. Others claimed that they will not forgive the approval of such a vague document.

A second obvious fact: It is necessary to know the republics' attitude toward the "Basic Guidelines." The Council of the Federation considered them at first reading, as it were. But an official attitude is yet to be expressed. The overall impression seems positive, but this is not enough for the solution of such an important question. B. Yeltsin's statement has also appeared, and it testifies that there is still a long way to go before total agreement between the center and the republics on the principles of transition to the market. And yet, without such agreement it will hardly be possible to implement a program which presupposes almost equal participation by the center and the republics, if not actually a greater participation by the republics.

By the end of the third hour of discussion, when deputies were evidently eager to get out of the circle delineated by the proposals "to approve or not to approve," two paradoxical ideas emerged. The first: Not to adopt any compromise version, but to revert to a choice between the president's and the government's programs. But reminders were right away issued as to why this can no longer be done.

And Deputy A. Levashev actually said this: "The USSR Supreme Soviet must ratify these 'Basic Guidelines.' But God forbid that economic practice should blindly follow this document's text."

And he cited examples to illustrate what can actually happen as a result of the theoretical docking of different programs. There is still a hope, however, that practical solutions will be dictated by life rather than just by a theoretical concept. Management structures will change, the government's composition will change, relations between the center and the republics will become clearer, and, in general, much will change within a brief time period, including our impression of transition to the market.

Actually, this was yet another version of the proposal to approve, adopt, and start acting and amending as we go along.

This is more or less the view taken by V. Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform Questions, when he summed up the discussion. But what was the outcome? The committee is likely to come out with the following proposal: To approve the submitted "Basic Guidelines for Stabilization of the National Economy and for Transition to a Market Economy," but to ask the USSR president to clarify the republics' attitude toward this concept prior to the Supreme Soviet debate.

And what conclusion can we draw following this sitting of the Committee for Economic Reform Questions? The compromise version of reforms as presented in the "Basic Guidelines" will more than likely be approved and adopted by the Supreme Soviet, which will enable executive power to take action. But the major question is whether such action will be exclusively along the "Basic Guidelines" tracks. Life will more than likely amend the theory.

Privileges Commission Chairman Interviewed

PM1810113690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report on interview with N.I. Ignatovich, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and newly elected chairman of the deputies' commission on privileges, by S. Karkhanin; place and date not given: "All Above Board and No Secrets; Chairman of Deputies' Commission Ponders Problem of Privileges"]

[Text] "Military servicemen and persons holding office in law enforcement bodies are guided in their official duties by the requirements of law and are not bound by the decisions of parties and social movements." This was the restrained wording used in the section of Article 16 of the draft law on public associations—which has given rise to a storm of debate in its previous versions—adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on Tuesday.

Draft laws on banking activity in the Soviet Union were approved on the first reading on the same day and a series of resolutions on questions concerning international life were also adopted. The next questions to be discussed at the session are being prepared in parallel to this. They include the work of a deputies' commission on regulating benefits and privileges. In view of readers' interest in this problem, which is confirmed by letters in the editorial mailbag, we talked to N.I. Ignatovich, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who was recently elected as new chairman of the commission. This is what he said:

"First we will have to give our commission a more accurate title. I feel it should be called the Commission on the Regulation of Privileges. Incidentally, at the moment the commission does not exist as such: For various reasons, most of the deputies who were on it before have either long since left this work or made a written request to be released from it. It is not surprising: Our commission is one of the most difficult and promises no laurels, but there are certainly plenty of 'thorns'.... That is why we are now forming the commission almost from scratch—and solely on a voluntary basis.

"The problem of privileges is an inveterate, burning problem and one which, in our troubled times, is a serious source of social tension that could cause an explosion of discontent with far-reaching consequences in any region. I consider it an unforgivable shortcoming on the part of our Supreme Soviet that it treated this commission's work with disdain for a long time. Essentially, it has done nothing—not counting the efforts of a handful of deputies. However, even with its new members, our commission is hardly likely to change anything without the support of all soviet deputies at various levels. Incidentally, when running as candidates, many deputies swore to voters that they would definitely tackle the problem of regulating privileges. That now seems to have been forgotten, for some reason.... Moreover, some of them have 'had their mouths closed,' so to speak, by various bribes—and so they are keeping quiet.

"Here is a simple example. In our group of deputies who are members of the Belorussian Soviet of Nationalities, I appear to be the only one who has not bought himself a car since being elected to the Supreme Soviet. Naturally, this is up to the conscience of each deputy concerned. But I know that there are also some purposefully minded people, and commissions like ours have been set up under the Supreme Soviets of a number of republics, including Belorussia and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

"I do not agree with all their proposals and decisions. In my opinion, it is unrealistic to think of abolishing privileges outright. The ultimate task of our commission is to define a clear but narrow circle of officials and the privileges due to them. There must be no secrets in this respect: Justice ends where secrecy begins. All privileges outside the prescribed circle should be considered abuses. I must stress that I am not talking about benefits: In my view, they should be studied by the appropriate Supreme Soviet committees—those responsible for the affairs of invalids, women, servicemen who have come back from Afghanistan, and so forth. What we are interested in is privileges, that is, benefits and advantages given to officials past and present and members of their families with regard to health care, access to health resorts and sanatoria, special transport, and housing.

"The problems here are far more complex than they might seem. For example, facilities belonging to the Health Ministry's former Fourth Main Administration should definitely be placed in reliable hands and not just given over to anyone. Otherwise, a great deal of property will be given over to wholesale pillage. Other deputies' committees must express their views on this matter.

"Clearly, as chairman of the commission I will have to withstand strong pressure from various quarters. I know what I am doing, however. I think I will be helped by my past work experience: I was an investigator in some very important cases in Belorussia and was more than once involved in inquiries into so-called economic cases. Privileges can be divided into several different levels: Those that we know about and those that we do not. For example, we have adopted documents on providing the infrastructure for presidential activity, but who decided the privileges for members of the Presidential Council? Who set their salaries and allocated apartments without the knowledge of USSR people's deputies?

"It will not be easy for us to get information on the delegated legislation which establishes various privileges. And what about 'traditional' privileges, which are not mentioned in any document? One of them affects us, incidentally: USSR people's deputies receive treatment in a medical establishment attached to the Council of Ministers. Why? It seems that this has been the practice for many years, established under past convocations....

"Or take this fact: I have talked to servicemen who were in Afghanistan and asked them whether they ever met the son of any influential official from their oblast while they were in the 'hot spots.' It seems that they did not.

"It is sometimes believed that our commission will simply gather information and present it to the Supreme Soviet. But then, in my opinion, it would not be worth the trouble. I believe that, once we have obtained and verified the information, we should present the session with drafts of specific legislation, submit proposals to the Council of Ministers, and, most important of all, monitor how they are implemented if the documents are given the form of law.

"The commission has received some 4,000 letters from voters since it has been in existence. They mainly contain points of a general nature and specific facts, plus exasperation that, despite deputies' promises, there have been very few real changes. What kind of letters would we like to receive? We need proposals, for example, on what to do with confiscated facilities and with sanatoria and dachas. It has been suggested, incidentally, that some former state dachas be auctioned off. But it is obvious who would be in a position to buy them. So we must be careful.

"The system of privileges has evolved over many years, so there will be enough work to keep us busy until the end of our term of office—and more besides. I would like to assure everyone that we will not have any secrets: There will be total clarity and openness." With these words Nikolay Ivanovich brought our conversation to a close.

That same day, deputies approved changes in the government after considering the USSR president's representations. A.P. Biryukova, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and N.V. Lemayev, USSR minister of the chemical and petroleum refining industry, have been released from their duties in connection with their retirement; and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and N.I. Yefimov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press, have been released from their duties in connection with their transfer to other work.

Political & Social

Soviet Trade Unions Congress Opens 23 Oct

Gorbachev Attends Congress

LD2210142790 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The 19th congress of Soviet trade unions will open in the Kremlin on Tuesday to create a new trade union centre and consider prospects for the activity of this huge mass organisation during the transition to market relations. The Soviet trade unions have a membership of more than 140 million.

The pre-congress discussions revealed opinions ranged from the conservative desire "to leave everything as it is" to ultra-radical calls for abolishing the trade union headquarters now that each republic has proclaimed itself an independent state and each republican trade union amalgamation is sovereign.

The trade unions of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Georgia have decided against sending official delegations to the forthcoming congress. Representatives of these republics will instead attend the congress as guests.

Nevertheless, a clear majority favours a strong, independent federal trade union centre.

The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU), regarded by many as an incarnation of the spirit of democratic centralism and power-and-pressure methods of management—is expected to be replaced by a new center, tentatively called the General Confederation of Soviet Trade Unions.

Its main function will be the protection of the working people's interests during radical economic reforms.

"We have come to the congress with the idea of creating the amalgamated confederation of the country's trade unions which will unite, on a voluntary basis, union sectoral and republican trade union organisations," AUCCTU Deputy Chairman Vladimir Shcherbakov said in an interview with the TRUD newspaper.

He said the trade union centre would be entrusted with the defence of working people's interests at the presidential council, parliamentary and government levels and be endowed with the right to legislative initiative and bill-making.

Shcherbakov expressed confidence that the trade union centre would be able to conclude an agreement with the government to determine the survival minimum, minimum wages and pensions, monetary compensation for inflation and other vital provisions.

President Mikhail Gorbachev, Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and Parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov have agreed to take part in the congress's work.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Elected to Presidium

LD2310102290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent Boris Simonov on the opening of the Soviet Trade Union Congress in Moscow on 23 October—live]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Today, after a short break, the delegates have assembled once again in the hall. Half an hour ago, Vladimir Pavlovich (Bakov) the chairman, was forced to call an unplanned interval, since the beginning turned out to be unexpectedly stormy.

Discussion of the agenda continued for an hour and a half, perhaps because the deputies are burning with impatience to express everything that the people who elected them to the congress instructed them to, and perhaps because the proposed agenda itself was not very clear. However, from the very first few minutes, words of annoyance, numerous amendments, and remarks about holding the congress began to be voiced in the hall and all of that stirred up the situation.

The fourth point of the agenda on the formation of a general confederation of trade unions of the USSR, was discussed very actively. It seemed to many that the question had already been decided and the question arose right away of why a confederation and not a coordinating council.

Proposals on dissolving the trade union center were made, as were proposals on its setting up at the congress. Other proposals also were made. Finally, the agenda was adopted without any substantial amendments, but, as I have said already, a great deal of time was spent discussing it.

During the interval, I received the latest information on the numerical strength of delegates to the Congress from the information service. In all, 2,402 people representing 141 million trade union members have been elected to the congress.

The trade union centers of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Georgia did not elect delegates to the Congress. However, there are 12 representative delegates of these republics from sectoral trade unions of the USSR.

Another bit of information. The working presidium of the Congress consists of 50 people. Comrade Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and Lukyanov were elected honorary members of the presidium. They are taking part in the work of the Congress. I want to finish my information from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses with that.

Ryzhkov Discusses Trade Unions

LD2210094490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1540 GMT on 21 October carries on its "Our Referendum, Problems, Views, Affairs" program presented by Boris Simonov a feature about the 19th congress of the AUCCTU, All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, which opens in Moscow on 23 October. The program contains recordings from the meeting between trade union leaders and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov in Moscow on 16 October. The recordings begin with the meeting's opening address by Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov, acting chairman of the AUCCTU:

"We have as our guest at the AUCCTU today Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers. We are very glad to welcome the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and we think today's visit could become the point of departure for fundamentally new interrelations between the trade unions, and the government. The need for our meeting has been brought about, first, by the trade unions' extreme concern with the state of affairs in the country, in the economy, on the consumer market, in the food supply sector, with spiraling price rises, and with the sharp decline in people's living standards; second, by the transition to market relations, and the mass of unresolved questions in this regard; third, by the need to clarify the interrelations between the trade unions and the government on the eve of the 19th congress of USSR trade unions.

I would like to dwell briefly on individual factors. When touring the country you can see for yourself that the situation is deteriorating all the time. Economic ties between enterprises are being severed. There are no raw materials. Works and factories are grinding to a halt. Disorder and chaos are increasing. Executive power has virtually been paralyzed. Speculation and organized crime are flourishing against this background. Which measures does the government intend to implement in order to return to the people the lost trust and confidence in tomorrow? What is being planned during the period of stabilization in order to radically improve the provision of food products and comodities to the population, and in order to intensify the fight against speculation and crime? We would ask you to inform us what account has been taken of the main observations and proposals made by the trade unions, including pricing and corresponding compensation for the population; limiting price rises for industrial output and consumer goods by establishing a ceiling for them; indexing the incomes of the population, including that part actively engaged in employment, depending on the rise in prices; determining and establishing by legislation a minimum subsistence level and a consumers basket; the problems of privatizing housing and fixing a socially guaranteed housing minimum; and problems linked with the sale of enterprises, property removed from the state ambit, and questions of privatization. We see today's meeting as a possibility for a constructive conversation between the USSR Council of Ministers and the trade unions in addressing labor, socioeconomic, and legal issues affecting the interests of the working people and labor colectives. We would like to know the government's view, its attitude toward the draft law on the rights of the USSR's trade unions, on the employment of the population, toward the USSR laws on enterprises in the USSR, on public associations, on taxation of enterprises, associations, and organizations. The comrades will probably also have other questions."

Simonov notes that ther were many questions, "sharp ones, one could even say not very diplomatic ones." Ryzhkov then says: "I think we should have a completely frank conversation today. I have heard a lot from you today, and if you hear a thing or two from me, don't you take offense either. There has been a lot of talk here that you are becoming new, that you have already become almost new. I think you are only becoming new. If we look at the documents which you give us, then excuse me, you are still a long, long way—in my view—from those ideals of the trade union movement which ought to actually eixst, if we are to get to the bottom of it. If we look through the papers which we receive, you are still half economic managers, economic managers through and through. I would also like to tell you the truth, so that you should know of this truth. I think all us, as they say, are living in a new era: all of us are restructuring. The government which you are criticizing very strongly has for a year and two months been living in a totally different atmosphere, not in the one which it had been living previously. You take a look at the situation which is currently taking shape in the country as a whole. And so, the government, as a sociologist put these thoughts to me, is, he said, a heroic and tragic government, and there is a great sense in this. Heroic, because we were the first to become a government which has both been formed and is living in totally new conditions; and tragic, because we are indeed going through such a crucible of our life. For this reason, the trade unions, you are following in our tracks, comrades. I understand that you are changing course, you are going into oposition or construtive opposition to the government. Well, I, for instance, am not dramatizing things, and evidently our nature dictates that we must be like that. But, the opposition must be only constructive; the dialogue must be a constructive one. What am I getting at here? We and you are indeed going through a very major school, a very major school, both the government is through the school, and the trade unions, too. There is now a feeling that they are gaining in strength. Today, the trade unions have finally found their voice. And so, I would like to say to you right away, comrades, we favor cooperation with the trade unions. I am telling you this precisely and clearly."

Ryzhkov then speaks on the subject of crime: "A week and a half ago we, on the Preisdium of the Council of Ministers, had a special session to hear Comrades Bakatin and Kryuchkov on the question of crime. I'l tell you that what is going on in our country today makes my hair stand on end. We think the main emphasis today has to be placed on street crime; second, on speculation; and third, on organized crime. And we need help. The militia can't cope alone. If, as concerns mafia elements, we have involved the KGB—and Comrade Kryuchkov is now setting up a directorate there especially from his people and we hope that he will put sensible people on the job, and that we'll start fighting organized crime more seriously—then as concerns street crime, we have to take it on only together, actually take it on together. Regarding speculation, we have submitted a draft law to the Supreme Soviet; the commissions are currently putting the finishing touches to it. Perhaps there will be partial alterations, but I think that, when the law on speculation comes out, I think, nevertheless, that the trade unions have to be involved. Why is it that, if speculation is currently, as they say, preventing us from living—the most acute issue in the country today—why should the trade unions stand on the sidelines? Why shouldn't we proceed together? And so, I think that regarding crime we certainly have to have definite cooperation. Well, comrades, I have noted down all of the questions which you have dwelt upon. I understand that there are very many of them, questions about medicines and other problems which, unfortunately, exist."

Simonov then notes that "Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov also dwelt in great detail on the problem of railway workers. Recognizing that there are more than enough quarrels on the country's lines, he warned nevertheless that a strike on the railways is impermissible. The situation that has emerged in the country is too critical."

Gorbachev Greets All-Union Miners Congress

LD2210134290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] An all-Union congress of miners opened today in Donetsk. Delegates from all coalfields in the country are taking part in it. Comrade Gorbachev, USSR president, has addressed an appeal to paticipants of the forum in which he called upon all miners of the country to show good will at this crucial time and support the measures for stabilization of the situation in the country, for the transfer of the economy to market relations and for the improvement of people's lives.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev appreciated the invitation to the congress but, unfortunately, he could not accept it because many important matters are being examined in Moscow at present. The USSR president wished the miners fruitful work.

Need for Gorbachev-Yeltsin Cooperation Stressed

LD2210141490 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Excerpts] Last week, the Soviet parliament passed the presidential program to stabilize the economy and shift to market relations nationwide.

Observers note, however, that in the political tandem of Gorbachev and Yeltsin the positions have been outlined, and they don't quite coincide. Which of the two events is more important for politologists now?

The nature of the current public views and of the rate of development of the nation, writes our commentator Vitaliy Gurov, shows that the relations between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin will determine many processes in the country:

As for the program to shift to market relations, as I see it, it has failed to become revolutionary. [passage omitted]

Notably, even a supporter of exactly centralized measures in an alleged shift to market relations, Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin, has said that in case the program is analyzed professionally, he would be highly critical about it, though as a politician he must forget it. Unlike Deputy Premier Abalkin, I will give my own view. Without doubt, Soviet people, exhausted by shortages in all areas of life, could now make any, even the most improbable breakthrough, but to do so they have to trust their political leaders in the first place who will call them to make the breakthrough.

Even though some people may not like it very much, there are only two persons in the Soviet Union who have such possibilities. They are Gorbachev and Yeltsin. People can trust only their alliance. Probably neither Gorbachev without Yeltsin nor Yeltsin without Gorbachev can score the necessary points for total trust. But, will they be able to find the strength again, the way it was on the last day of July, to meet each other halfway?

Last week, the two leaders diverged quite strongly by making corresponding political statements. Boris Yeltsin is now having a short rest because of worsened health following a car accident. He is expected to resume his duties in about 10 days.

Hopefully, the passions will die out by that time and possibly these two most popular men in this country will resume their dialogue. In the long run, their accord is needed not for personal reasons at all: The nation needs it, and, for their sake, everything else may be discarded.

RSFSR Brings Criminal Charges Against Ligachev

LD1910205790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] It is reported from Tomsk that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic procuracy has opened a criminal investigation in the case of the destruction of the Kolpashevo graves, where the remains of hundreds of victims of Stalinist repression have been discovered. This operation was carried out with the consent of Yegor Ligachev, who at that time was the first secretary of the Tomsk CPSU oblast committee. Evidently, this became possible—the opening of a criminal case—after Ligachev became a pensioner.

Editor Responds to Coup d'Etat Story

91UN0052A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 6 Oct 90 pp 1-2

[Letter by Anatoliy Yurkov, editor in chief of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA: "Is the Newspaper Being Called on the Carpet?"]

[Text] To A.P. Yurkov, editor in chief of the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA:

This is to notify you that by a decision of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media and Liaison With Public Organizations, a commission of deputies has been set up to investigate articles in the newspapers PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA...on a coup d'etat that is being prepared.

The commission suggests that the following information be provided to it:

1. When and from where did the editorial office of the newspaper receive the text of "Action Program-90?"

2. How is the fact to be explained that an article concerning "Action Program-90," which was adopted in late July, appeared on the pages of the newspaper in early October?

3. Why was Point 32, based upon which the readers and the editorial office could have easily determined the true authorship of the program, omitted when the text of the document was reprinted?

We ask that this information be furnished before 8 October 1990.

[signed] Yu.M. Luchinskiy, chairman of the commission, deputy chairman of the Committee for the Mass Media.

This is notification No. 7/17-8/233 from the commission for investigating newspaper articles that was delivered by courier on the evening of 3 October, the day we published the article "A Civil War Program?!" Of course, this super-fast response to the statement of the newspaper may only be dictated by extraordinary circumstances. We also understand that all investigations are difficult, rough, and unpleasant endeavors, and this is why we are prepared to make this hard work easier for Russian parliamentarians.

Our readers know that the editorial office of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA subscribes to the ideas of glasnost, democracy, pluralism, and perestroyka. We have nothing to hide from anybody, and this is why we want to propose that Yu.M. Luchinskiy conduct this investigation openly, so that both our readers and the broad public will be, so to speak, participants in the events and will be able to form a firsthand opinion on what is happening. This is all the more so because both the journalists of our newspaper and our readers have many questions to ask of the Russian Democratic Forum itself regarding "Action Program-90" and the goals outlined in it by the authors of the document. If the interest of the editorial board of the newspaper and the commission is due to the same considerations—and this is what we hope for and count on—then there is all the more reason to do everything publicly.

However, before I respond to the questions asked by Yu.M. Luchinskiy I would like to make some brief remarks on this occasion.

...I, while still a young journalist with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, was called on the carpet for the first time about 25 years ago. In a cool office off one of the doorways on Old Square, I had to answer three questions, as is the case now.

1. From where and with whose assistance did the editorial office or I obtain documents on the basis of which I succeeded in proving in my article "On the Baykal" that construction of the Baykal Pulp Combine threatened to kill the unique lake, that the lake was already being poisoned, and that the much-praised pollution-control facilities of the Pulp and Paper Plant were a clever deception?

2. Why was this article published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA at exactly the time that the public began to get interested in the project, which was declared an All-Union Shock-Work Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Youth Communist League] Construction Project? Does this mean that the author wants to discredit the very notion of patronage over shock-work construction projects by the Leninist Komsomol?

3. Why did we not seek advice before writing about a significant issue of state and begin to inflame unhealthy passions? And so on, and so forth.

The heat of that summer, which was hot in Old Square and, to my mind, in all of Moscow, did not find its way to the cool office. However, the carpet burned my soles.

I had a plump briefcase filled with a great number of documents. I have always had luck finding good people, especially when I was with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. One of them helped me obtain materials signed by N.S. Khrushchev—yes, indeed, he was a party to the fatal attempt on the Baykal. Another brought documents from the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR Supreme Soviet, which testified to the gravity of the problem. There also were protests by scientists in this briefcase—a good one-half of the Academy of Sciences, and protocols on testing the "model of Baykal behavior given the operation of the pulp plant" that was held at...the Gorkiy Reservoir. To be sure, the protocols maintained that nothing would happen to the Baykal. There was, however, expert and devastating evidence proving why these protocols could not be believed. There was a letter from unforgettable Dmitriy Dmitrieyvich Shostakovich that was particularly valuable to me. Shostakovich wrote that he might put out the word to his people in my and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's defense if they start dragging us on carpets. There was also a message from Leonid Leonov who had already put out the word to his people.

However, they did not let me produce a single document I had readied. The carpet champions of truth were not interested in the issue of saving the Baykal itself; they were concerned about how to snub an author and a newspaper that had learned too much, and wanted everyone to learn this.

To be sure, this difficult talk was not referred to as a party inquiry. My party comrades unceremoniously called it a conversation.

Subsequently, I was stigmatized by the Komsomol Central Committee first secretary.

I was ultimately branded by a CPSU Central Committee secretary at a large ideological aktiv conference. They said that the campaign in defense of the Baykal in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA had international repercussions, especially in Europe, which was choking because of a shortage of pure drinking water. At the time, there were still no "Greens" in the West, but it turned out that there were intelligent beings.

Times have changed, but carpets have not.

Since then, carpet-type conditioning has been practiced in all kinds of offices, including those with private entrances and personal body guards, conditioning one on one, and to the sound of a chorus of collective instructors.

However, this is it! The carpet games that are such an insult to the dignity of both sides have come to an end: The party that began perestroyka by introducing glasnost safeguards the latter as much as possible, especially after the 28th CPSU Congress. Objective criticism of the actions (or lack thereof) of any Politburo member, including the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, even of the entire Central Committee, does not entail at present "investigative commissions..." Examples are easy to come by.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA criticized the top echelon of the party and state leadership. The newspaper raised the issue of depriving "the elite stratum" of a quite costly privilege—a personal airport, a personal aircraft detachment, and personal aircraft ferrying their distinguished passengers, with all their servants, be it to foreign partners or to domestic beaches.

Following this article in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, rumbling was heard in all the corridors of power. However, neither the government, the Politburo, nor the president demanded that we explain ourselves. To be sure, a commission was created, but in order to review the issue raised by the newspaper and to take the necessary measures. Such measures were taken; they notified the newspaper of them, and we, in turn, notified our readers.

However, we were apparently too hasty in drawing a conclusion on this basis that bygones are bygones. What difference does it make for me who calls me to the carpet—"an investigative commission" of the most democratic parliament or a zealous party apparatchik trying to justify his leadership position?

So, I respond in turn to all three questions asked by "the investigative commission."

1. We have already communicated when and from where we received the text in the introduction to the article "A Civil War Program?!" published on 3 October. If the commission has failed to notice, we communicate: This was reprinted from issue 15 of the magazine DIALOG. In principle, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA does not always engage in reprinting someone else's materials; the newspaper also prepares its own articles on the most acute issues of concern to our readers. The newspaper enjoys their extensive support, as shown by the editorial mailbag.

2. RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA is, perhaps, the only central newspaper to start a permanent column in which it regularly familiarizes readers with informal movements in our country, not necessarily in Russia, and their programs, tasks, and goals. For example, our newspaper was the only one to publish in full the Declaration of the First All- Union Conference of the Councils of Labor Collectives that was recently held in Tolyatti, despite RSFSR People's Deputy N.I. Travkin vowing to eat his hat if a single party newspaper published this declaration by workers. There are such a multitude of informal movements in our country that from time to time proclaim themselves to be new parties that no newspaper will undertake to publish their documents day after day. Besides, we do not aspire to this.

3. A rule exists that is commonly known among professionals to the effect that nobody has a right to add any arbitrary insertions to the material reprinted. It is permissible to abridge, which is what we did. As far as Point 32 is concerned, it was absent from the material we borrowed.

Since we have agreed on an open investigation, I would like to ask the parliamentary commission several counter-questions, and to obtain answers to them.

1. Who among the parliamentarians of Russia took part in developing and preparing "Action Program-90" of the Russian Democratic Forum and when? When did the RSFSR Supreme Soviet learn about the existence of this document and from what sources?

2. How does the parliament of Russia or at least "the investigative commission" evaluate "Action Program-90": Do they believe it to facilitate the consolidation of the efforts of our society, the CPSU Central Committee, and the president, aimed at implementing a program of transition to a market economy and civil accord?

3. Will an RSFSR Supreme Soviet commission be created to investigate the appearance of, or at least to make a qualified evaluation of, "Action Program-90" and the plans of its authors?

4. How many copies of this "Program" were run off, how many addresses was it sent to, and had it been publicly discussed anywhere prior to this? Or was it compiled secretly and subsequently sent to the addressees selected beforehand?

Finally, which publication in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA did the commission deem to be a publication on a **coup d'etat** being prepared, and on what basis?

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA is prepared to familiarize its readers and the broad public with answers to these questions, unless the commission considers them to be not subject to public release due to some convincing considerations, especially for reasons of public peace.

Ministers, KGB Chief on Strengthening Order

LD2210153190 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Borisov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—"Radically revised legislation and efficient law enforcement mechanisms are needed to successfully combat crime," Soviet Justice Minister Veniamin Yakovlev told a press conference here today on problems of strengthening law and order and ensuring the safety of Soviet citizens. Taking part in it were Soviet Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, Assistant Procurator-General Aleksey Vasiliyev and Vice- Chairman of the USSR Supreme Court Aleksandr Filatov.

Bakatin noted that a draft national anti-crime programme had been submitted for approval to the Soviet parliament and would be discussed this December. Turning to the fulfillment of the presidential decree to disarm illegal formations in the country, Bakatin said that the desire of sovereign republics to have their own legalised armed forces and even armies seriously aggravated the situation and was not in keeping with the presidential decree.

He said the Soviet Interior Ministry had asked the president to consider the possibility of setting up limited contingents in the republics to discharge internal functions.

The press conference focused on problems of combatting organised crime. According to KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, it has now "assumed quite unexpected dimensions". "Particularly alarming," he said, "was the fact that criminal groups, connected with the 'shadow economy' made use of the situation and flaws in legislation 'to seize bits of power here and there'. Their actions are extremely cruel and sadistic." Kryuchkov said organised crime was becoming the main concern of law enforcement bodies.

Assistant Procurator-General Vasiliyev said that more than 920 criminal gangs were arrested in the country over the past six months.

Asked what measures were taken by law enforcement bodies to stop the dismissal of communist party members from schools in the western Ukraine, for instance, he said that the Procurator's Office had submitted protests on each case to the repubican supreme soviet, which are now being considered. "The Procurator's Office will be even more resolute and tough in solving such problems in future," Vasiliyev stressed.

Vasiliyev described the destruction and sacrilege of monuments to Soviet Government and state leaders as "typical criminal acts". According to the Interior Ministry, 76 monuments have already been subjected to such acts of vandalism. Proceedings were instituted in 74 cases. However, the situation is complicated by the fact that decisions to destroy monuments are often passed by local government bodies.

"Such decisions are unlawful," he said, "and they violate the laws in force. To cut short such processes, the procurators must institute proceedings on all known cases, must investigate them and call to answer everybody who commits acts that are punishable by law," he said.

KGB on Criminal Damage

LD2210174790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1456 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Borisov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct—Speaking at a news conference here today, KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov pointed out the need to create an obstacle on the path of economic crimes through the use of joint enterprises. The news conference was devoted to questions concerning the strengthening of law and order and the safety of USSR citizens. Criminal elements, he explained, are in a number of cases using joint enterprises, inflicting damage on the country running into millions of dollars.

An effective element in resolving the problem of pumping money obtained by illegal means into the country's economy could, in the view of USSR Internal Affairs Minister Vadim Bakatin, lie in the creation of powerful financial inspection organs and the introduction of obligatory income declaration.

Replying to a question from a TASS correspondent, Vadim Bakatin said that the question of dismantling party control in the organs of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] had meaning when political organs existed in its system and when there was no law on parties. The political organs have now been abolished in the MVD, and the law on parties makes it possible to engage in this or that activity, irrespective of political views. He reported in particular that, according to the latest data, of the 600,000 communists in the MVD system, 12,000 have left the CPSU.

In the view of Aleksandr Filatov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, an officer of the law enforcement organs has the right to be a member of any party, and "his removal from work in the organs, for which appeals are currently being voiced, is a breach of human rights and of the country's constitution."

At the request of a TASS correspondent, Vadim Bakatin cited the statistics for infringements of the law with regard to foreigners in the USSR. He said that over the first nine months of this year, 5,215 crimes were committed against foreign citizens, or over 30 percent more than over the same period last year. The minister noted moreover that in more than 4,000 cases, the foreigners had by their behavior provoked antisocial elements into committing infringements of the law by entering into contact with them for the sale of currency, drugs, and so on. Vadim Bakatin reported that 53 special units have been set up in the MVD to fight this variety of crime and that contacts have been established with embassies.

Replying to journalists' questions reqarding the unification of the family of former KGB officer Oleg Gordiyevskiy, who fled to Britain, Vladimir Kryuchkov said that "we are approaching this matter from a humane standpoint." "At one time we suggested that Gordiyevskiy and his wife meet in Prague, where they might resolve their affairs," he said. "We have now changed our point of view. We are giving Gordiyevskiy guarantees that in the event of his returning to the USSR, he will not be subjected to punishment; he can live and work in Moscow, and thus be reunited with his family." However, the chairman of the KGB noted, one also has to bear in mind the circumstance that, following his defection, Gordiyevskiy's wife submitted a statement to court and their marriage has been dissolved.

Criminals 'Acquiring Power'

LD2210173990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Borisov and Igor Peskov report]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct—An active improvement of legislation and the creation of machinery to ensure the observance of laws are necessary for a successful campaign against crime, according to Venyamin Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice. He was speaking here today at a news conference devoted to issues of strengthening law and order and the security of USSR citizens. Taking part were Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, Aleksey Vasilyev, deputy general procurator, and Aleksandr Filatov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court.

Vadim Bakatin noted in this connection that the draft of a nationwide program to combat crime in the country, which is to be approved this December, has now been presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Touching upon the issue of fulfilling the decree of the USSR president concerning the disarmament of illegal armed formations in the country, the head of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] said that the aspiration of sovereign republics to have their own legalized armed forces and their own army seriously complicate the situation and go beyond the context of the president's decree. At the same time he stated that the USSR MVD has proposed to the USSR president that he consider the possibility of creating limited contingents in the republics to carry out internal functions.

Considerable attention was paid during the news conference to issues concerning the law enforcement bodies' campaign against organized crime. According to KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, this kind of crime has now "acquired a scale that we did not expect." He said that particular concern is caused by the taking advantage of the situation and the imperfect state of the laws, have "acquired an opportunity to cut off slices of power". Their actions are distinguised by extreme cruelty and sadism. In his opinion, first place in the activity of the law enforcement bodies goes to the campaign against organized crime.

The representative of the USSR Procuracy reported that over the past six months, more than 920 criminal groups have been rendered harmless in the country.

Replying to a question about what steps are being taken by the law enforcement bodies to put a stop to actions relating to the dismissal of teachers from schools for belonging to the CPSU, in particular in the Western Ukraine, Aleksey Vasilyev, the USSR deputy general procurator, said that representations have been made to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet by the USSR Procuracy on all these instances, and that these questions are being considered. In the future, Aleksey Vasilyev stressed, the Procuracy will display even greater resolution and toughness in tackling these issues.

Aleksey Vasilyev described as "typical petty crime" instances of the destruction and defilement of memorials to Soviet figures and statesmen in the country. According to the MVD, 76 memorials have now been vandalized, and 74 sets of criminal proceedings have been instituted on these incidents. However, the situation is complicated by the fact that decisions to pull down memorials are frequently made by the local authority bodies themselves. He said that these decisions are illegal and are at variance with the established legislative norms. In order to halt these processes, Aleksey Vasilyev Believes, the procuracies must instigate criminal proceedings in all these instances, examine them, and bring to book those persons in whose actions a corpus delicti is established.

KGB Representatives Answer Officer's Allegations

LD2010164190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1915 GMT on 20 October, as part of the "Vid (View and Others)" program presented by Lyubimov, carries a 10-minute studio interview with Col. Yuriy Prerin, a representatives of the KGB press office, and Maj. Andrey Olegov, a representative of the KGB Moscow branch, and asks them to comment upon Korolov's allegations, specifically whether there could be a KGB coup. Olegov says that "with their hands on their heart many KGB employees, most of them, would say that our people and our society simply do not have to worry about things like that." Olegov continues: "Everyone in our society, as the saying goes, has the right to his own views, and to say what he thinks. Moreover, Valentin Korolov also has the full right to express his own views about his work in KGB bodies. After all, he has worked there for 18 years. And we are not in any way trying to refute what he thinks or what he believes." He proceeds to say that the KGB is concerned with one thing only: to show its true face. But the fact remains that every intelligence service, abroad too, "has an apparatus of assistants". Pressed to give figures, Olegov adds: that "there are 1 million times fewer of them than suggested by Korolov, or even millions of times fewer."

Prerin says: "I can say with full responsibility, many times fewer."

Asked by Lyubimov whether the KGB is prepared to familiarize the "Vzglyad" editorial office with any documents to this effect, for example, on the number of people employed by the KGB. Prerin says: "Not until than we are given permission by our government and our parliament to acquaint the public with budget figures and with the number of those actually listed as KGB cadres."

Lyubimov then asks: "Can you not show us any of the Lubyanka dungeons." Prerin says: "we have no dungeons...there are no basements in the Lubyanka." He continues: "There used to be a prison at the Lubyanka. But it does not exist either. It has not existed for a long time—over 20 years." He then suggests that the cells that did exist in the past were all on upper floors. Prerin then proceeds to say that Western film crews were allowed to see for themselves whether there are any dungeons.

Touching on future plans for Lubyanka, Prerin says: "An idea is now being developed: since the former building of the Lubyanka internal prison is somewhat adjacent to the premises occupied by the public relations center, we are seriously thinking of moving the accountancy departments out of there and to make it—just like the public relations center—open for the public as a sort of a memorial, having restored as much as possible all the attributes of the internal prison, that is, having restored what used to be there when it was a prison."

Talking about Korolov's allegations about KGB Chairman Kryuchkov, Prerin says: "I used to work for the directorate headed by Kalugin, that is, in foreign counterintelligence." He then points out that Kryunchkov is a professional having worked for the KGB over 23 years, and having now made the organization more open that it ever used to be before. This is recognized abroad more than at home, he adds. In conclusion, Olegov suggests that Korolov should read the book "Confessions of an Intelligence Boss". Finally Lyubimov thanks his guests and proceeds to introduce the next item.

KGB Officer Discusses Organization

LD2010143890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1915 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Report on an interview with KGB Lieutenant Colonel Valentin Yuriyevich Korolov by an unidentified correspondent; date and place not given; from the "Vzglyad (view)" segment of the "VID (View and Others)" program—passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] [Korolov] "Our unit worked for several so-called special services. I worked, in particular, in the Israeli area, to counter Israeli activity by Israeli intelligence on the territory of Moscow and Moscow oblast. That was my task.

"In the past three years, I headed that area, as part of the Moscow directorate.

[Correspondent] "Did you catch any spies?

[Korolov] "In that period, our section arrested Anatoliy Shcharanskiy for spying. He was sentenced in 1977."

[Correspondent] Korolov, Valentin Yuriyevich. Born 1946. Russian. Length of service in the security organs: 18 years. He was engaged in combatting organized crime for five years and spent the rest of the time in counterintelligence. He is now a lieutenant colonal of the KGB in the reserve. He has three medals for excellent service. Married. A daughter, Irina. Hobby: writing satirical poetry.

[Korolpv] "During this period, the section arrested three workers who stole a piece of secret metal from their works and tried to palm it off to some foreign diplomat to get some booze money. We sent a KGB officer along instead and sentenced them for spying over this matter.

[Correspondent] "A wonderful success for the Moscow directorate for combatting espionage. Did the Pamyat society help in this struggle?

[Korolov] "Personally, I did not have any agents among them. I had confidential relations with some of them, but I studied one of them as a candidate for recruitment as the man had good contacts in those circles. When I no longer needed that man, I offered him to the so-called fifth area, ideological counterintelligence. There they refused him, saying that they had such positions in the leadership that they did not even have to meet them.

[Correspondent] "In the Pamyat leadership?

[Korolov] "Yes, in Pamyat. The man remained unemployed as a KGB helper, and we simply parted."

[Correspondent] In Korolov's opinion, Pamyat, in its present format, was created by the Moscow KGB as an instrument of political, and in the future, armed struggle against undesirable social trends. All the eminent functionaries of Pamyat were recruited by the secret police.

Sukharev, the procurator general, retired this week. What is your forecast for the leadership of the KGB?

[Korolov] "I have never known any KGB official who would not like to see Kryuchkov's resignation, as he is not a professional. I have never come across any other opinions. We all saw how he, at the session of the supreme soviet quote, authoritatively, unquote, stated that the KGB did not have any agents, did not carry out actions against Soviet citizens, did not read letters, did not listen to telephone calls, and so on. Subsequently, all of this was refuted by his colleagues in later speeches, and this was not so long ago.

[Correspondent] "You are referring to Kalugin?

[Korolov] "Yes."

[Correspondent] Kryuchkov, Vladimir Aleksandrovich. Army General. Born 29 February, 1924, Volgograd. Russian. Called up in winter 1942, but Volodya Kryuchkov did not serve at the front. 1943 on Komsomol work. Member of the party, just like Chebrikov, from 1944. In 1955, not long before the punitive tank action, in Budapest, he was appointed secretary of the embassy in Hungary. The ambassador at that time was Andropov. In 1959, Kryuchkov joined the Central Committee apparatus. In 1965, assistant to Central Committee Secretary Andropov. In may 1967, Andropov headed the committee and from that same year Kryuchkov began his career in the KGB. In 1978, he was deputy chairman. Ten years later he was chairman. He has been awarded two Orders of Lenin. Wife: Yekaterina Petrovna. He has two children. Hobbies: skiing and theatre.

In the West, he won doubtful popularity after he, on 4 October, at a sitting of the Presidium, of the Council of Ministers, proposed fingerprinting the entire population. The desire to take the fingerprints of all citizens, including serene babies and paralyzed old people, not surprisingly caused a storm of indignation in our fatherland.

Former Moscow Komsomol member, head of the all-Union antifascist center, Yevgeniy (Prosochkin) said that, despite Kryuchkov's statement, there are no healthy wings in Pamyat. But, it is no coincidence that the chief of the KGB, a member of the top party nomenklatura, tries to whitewash the Nazis, to praise them. Pamyat, using members of the RSFSR Writers Union as intermediaries, is in contact with leaders of the Russian Communist Party. The Polozkov supporters include many colonels and generals of the KGB.

[Korolov] "The virtual boss of the committee, the virtual chairman, is Bobkov. Bobkov became first deputy chairman afer Andropov left for the Central Committee for the post of secretary. No one doubted that we are obliged to Bobkov for the problems of the appearance of the dissidents and refuseniks and Pamyat also.

[Correspondent] "Does the poet Bobkov have anything to do with the first deputy chairman?

[Korolov] "As far as I know, it is his son who received the state prize of the RSFSR for 1986. I think, for literature. He works in the editorial collegium of the magazine MOLODAYA GVARDIYA.

[Correspondent] "General Kalugin said that many KGB officials worked under cover and he, peronally, Kalugin, under the cover of the Academy of Sciences. Does anyone work under the cover of government offices or the Supreme Soviet?

[Korolov] "They do. There are such people in the union government.

[Correspondent] "In the present government?

[Korolov] "Yes, in the present government. Moreover, I am personally familiar with such a person. He is my former boss. At one time, he was the head of my section, and then a department, and then deputy chairman of the second service. Finally, he got into, he was appointed to, the council of Ministers of the USSR, to the post of head of a sector of one of the departments of the council of Ministers. From this work, he was transferred to the post, directly from head of a sector to the post of chairman of the economic directorate of the USSR Council of Ministers, and, literally, very recently, he was appointed administrator of affairs of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR. His name is Aleksandr Nikolayevich (Sterlikov).

[Correspondent] "Are there any of your people among people in the arts?

[Korolov] "Certainly. The point is that the so-called active reserve of the KGB, that is, people who work simultaneously in operational units and in various establishments and organizations, there are such people in the writers' union, in Glavlit [chief directorate of literary publishing houses], and so on. Glavlit has now been renamed, but, in essence, nothing has changed. In effect, this is a structure subordinate to the State Security Committee.

"The point is that the committee has everything that a state should have, i.e., its own enterprises, its own state farms, its own research institutes, its own army, special purpose troops, its own navy. It has everything. Moreover, it has undisclosed means which it can use, and one of the most effective is its agents.

[Correspondent] "Of course, you cannot give the figures, but what order of magnitude are they?

[Korolov] "There are many millions.

[Correspondent] "There are four army generals in the KGB and the same number of arms of the forces. Despite the fact that the border troops perform the functions of customs officers, the personnel is subordinate to the committee's apparatus. The U.S. national security agency has 30,000 soldiers and sailors, whereas the KGB's combat units, even by official data, have about 250,000.

"Is the KGB really powerful enough either to organize or, itself, to carry out a coup in the country?

[Korolov] "Yes, quite powerful enough."

KGB Questions DIE ZEIT Reporter

AU1910152590 Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 19 Oct 90 p 15

[Report by Alexander Furmann: "What the KGB Wanted to Know About DIE ZEIT"]

[Text] Kiev, October—After I had had lunch in the Radio Kiev canteen, the telephone rang. A male voice asked me something about one of my programs and wanted to set a date for a meeting. The voice sounded confidential, but a certain tone—a language of command—was not to be missed.

Later in the car I was told: "You are obviously surprised that we kept you waiting for such a long time," the stranger smiled at me. "May I see your duty pass," I asked. He quickly showed it to me: "Yevgeniy Pavlovski. Committee for State Security."

"Well, Major Pavlovski, what do you want from me?" "You spent a long time in the FRG. You certainly know a lot," he said.

"Do you assume that during the three months of work for DIE ZEIT I was infected with the capitalist virus," I asked. "No," he assured me, "but we would like to know how the ideological opponent behaved."

"Who?" I was not sure whom he meant.

"DIE ZEIT journalists," Major Pavlovsky answered, and made himself comfortable. Then he looked me straight in the eye and said: "You may admit that you wondered when we would approach you."

I caught myself thinking that he was right. However, his visit shows that perestroyka does not mean much to the KGB. Bitterly I recalled the quarrels that I had with my friends in Hamburg, because at the time I vehemently protested their assumption that the KGB fully controlled East-West relations.

"Let us talk business," my visitor broke the silence. "I want you to prepare a list of the persons you got to know in Germany, and to write a few things about these people. Character studies, for example."

I was speechless for a moment. "Helmut Schmidt also works for DIE ZEIT. You can delete him from the list and read the books that have been written about him. That should be sufficient." Major Pavlovski frowned. "Okay!" he finally said, in a resolute way.

"I do not understand why you want to know everything about the editors of DIE ZEIT," I dared to say. Now the major was annoyed. "Do not pretend to be so stupid. These people wanted to influence you, and you did not realize that because you are not a professional."

"Do you really think so," I asked him. The situation changed. I started wondering. Major Pavlovski became emotional. "The West wants information on the political situation in the Ukraine, because it wants to foresee developments here."

I admitted that I, too, would have like to know something about our future. I asked him whether the KGB does not want to finally abandon the policy of the past. After all, he knows what happened to his colleagues in the GDR. The voice of the KGB officer sounded vigorous and his gestures seemed determined. "Such a thing will never happen to the KGB. People trust us. We stick to our principles. In addition, quite a number of today's heroes of perestroyka owe a great deal to us. However, we do not betray our friends."

"You should rather speak about the mood among the KGB," I replied and told him that I heard that numerous KGB employees have quit the service. "Is this not true?"

He made a face and refused stubbornly to say anything. "I hope you will not talk to anybody about our meeting," he emphasized.

I promised to do the opposite. Major Pavlovsky smiled. He liked my joke. However, I asked DIE ZEIT to help me keep my promise.

Youth Paper Interviews Kalugin

91UF0039B Kishinev MOLODEZH MOLDAVII in Russian 11 Sep 90 p 6

[Second of two installments of interview with former KGB Major General Oleg Kalugin by IMA-Press correspondents O. Moroz and L. Zagalskiy; place and date not given: "A Deputy Mandate Instead of General's Stripes"]

[Text] [Moroz] Are KGB functions within the country changing at least to some degree? People frequently express uneasiness in their letters: Will the former practice of listening in on telephone conversations, going through mail, and compiling dossiers continue... How do they use the information they obtain this way? Can it be used in a court of law, for expelling someone from the party, and so forth?

[Kalugin] All these means are being utilized fully, just as they were in previous years. But with the existing judicial practice, all materials gathered this way must be legalized. For example, say that you were to convey to someone in a letter news or a suggestion which, in the opinion of the KGB, is of a reprehensible nature and could serve as a piece of evidence. They could not simply say: We intercepted the letter. It is necessary to legalize the situation. So the post office usually "loses" the letters, that is, they have developed an entire system of actions which is designed to draw attention away from the main figure. The same thing is true of listening in on conversations. Their content could be turned over to some KGB agent. The agent holds a conversation for verification without indicating that he already knows the other person's viewpoint. As a rule, the individual expresses the same or close to the same opinion, and after that everything is simple.

[Zagalskiy] But how can this be corroborated if the conversation did not take place face to face?

[Kalugin] For purposes of the court, as a rule, three witnesses are sufficient. The KGB has sufficient apparatus to organize the corresponding documentation. In general this is a "creative" process which requires a certain amount of selectivity in order for everything to look legal.

[Moroz] There have been organizations and groupings with fascist leanings operating in the country for a long time. They have become more active in recent weeks. For example, in January- February there were widespread rumors about preparations for Jewish pogroms. "These are all rumors, we do not know anything. If you find something out, report it to us," say the KGB workers (we heard this segment with our own ears on the radio on 9 February).

Rumors... Conversations... Something immaterial. But now, there is also something tangible—many people have submitted applications for exit visas and others are about to submit them. The people who are leaving, as a rule, are highly skilled—there is nothing "over there" for people without skills or a trade to do. This is causing irreparable harm to the state. In general, we have large-scale sabotage on our hands (not to mention the actual trampling on human rights). And where is the KGB?

[Kalugin] This is a serious problem. Unfortunately, neither the country's leadership or the KGB as a constituent element of it has been able to actually do anything to stop the outflow of brainpower. It would seem that there would be an immense number of ways of dispelling fear. If only to use these same mass media to inform each citizen that any case of ethnic oppression is being mercilessly punished. After all, the law exists and the way it works could already have been demonstrated a hundred times in real situations. Take just the scandal in the Central House of Literati. How it is being investigated. This is the same dragging of feet. I am convinced it is possible to reassure people and, of course, reinforce everything with legislative measures. But this is not being done!

[Moroz] How does the KGB feel about the Pamyat society?

[Kalugin] Pamyat presents no danger to the authorities. Leftists are much more dangerous to the authorities. Of course, the KGB has "its" people in Pamyat as well. But it is thought that everything is in order there. Knowing whose support and protection they are enjoying, "its" people may also go beyond the framework of instructions and display a Black Hundred kind of initiative. And so far nobody is condemning them for this.

[Moroz] Speaking at the February Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, V.A. Kryuchkov said that perestroyka should not be carried out so quickly: "...Would it not be worth our while to do a more thorough assessment of where we are from the standpoint of development? Perhaps in some areas we should even halt or at least do a better job of calculating our steps forward." And then followed the phrase: "We need perestroyka," which can be read as "Of course, we need perestroyka but..." Does this not mean that the KGB is finding it difficult to find its place in the present day (I would compare it to loggers floating logs over rapids)?

[Kalugin] That is exactly right. I can also tell you that the present KGB leadership, with a small exception, bears full responsibility for the injustice, if you will, for the crimes to our society, to our people, perpetrated during the seventies and the beginning of the eighties. All these leaders are in place. Just one of them retired recently as procurator—Ivan Pavlovich Abramov. They kicked out the watch dog. This is the person who organized all the persecutions of dissidents and cultural figures, beginning with Solzhenitsyn, Tarkov, Lyubimov, and Aksenov, and ending with thousands of other more modest and less celebrated figures. They all had the psychology of the Brezhnev school, or maybe even the Stalin school. Nostalgia for those times is their organic condition, it is their way of thinking and life. How can they speak seriously about perestroyka?

[Moroz] What do you think, what should the KGB do next so that the people will lose their hatred mixed with fear of it—restructure, divide into two organizations like the CIA and the FBI, reduce its size, reorient it, get rid of it altogether? That has to do with the organizational aspect of the matter. But there is also the moral aspect. Does it not seem to you that the KGB should repent—give a public assessment both of the crimes of their predecessors during Stalin's times and their own recent activity under Brezhnev?

[Kalugin] I will begin at the end: Indeed, repentance and purification are needed first of all. And whether or not there will be forgiveness will depend on that. But as long as there has been no repentance and no purification, what kind of forgiveness can there be? The people's attitude toward the KGB remains the same as it has been for many years.

As for reforms, I think the KGB should be fully depoliticized—in the sense that it should not be an instrument of the party and the leadership of the country. It must in all ways be made equal to other law enforcement organs—the militia, the procuracy, and so forth—and all of its privileges should be taken away. Furthermore, I think the KGB should be deprived of many of the functions of power that make it politically dangerous. What is needed to do this? In the first place I would separate the investigation and turn it over to the president's office. This is an independent organ and it is not mixed up in any questionable internal affairs. In the second place, I would reduce the size of the organs by a minimum of half. Their number today greatly exceeds what it was before the war...

[Moroz] That is, the number of members of that same NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] which carried out all those monstrous repressions.

[Kalugin] ...Of course. It would seem that we had left those times far behind us—what is the purpose of this apparatus? After all, it is not good for anything. In the third place, we must completely eliminate the system of political investigations. Gathering information because of political motives, because of differences in thinking—which exist today—that is immoral. I am not against there being assistants and agents—no police organization can do without them—but this should be determined by the laws and firmly established norms. It is permissible to use them in investigative activity in fighting against organized crime or espionage... That is, in cases where they actually do provide for state security. But when it comes to political enemies, this should be forbidden once and for all.

Further, I would completely separate the investigative apparatus from the KGB. There should not be a separate investigation in the militia, the procuracy, and the KGB—there should be just one investigation. And the border troops are another thing. Why not combine them with customs and make a main administration of customs and border control? And in our future common European home why do we need these hundreds of thousands of people in green caps who are found in the cities, in the forests, and in the icy areas? What are they protecting? After all, spies no longer cross either the Bering Straits or the North Pole... nor our southern borders. There are nomads and some profligates who have lost their way... But it is mainly Soviet citizens who flee. So the border guards actually exist not to ward of a threat from the outside but to prevent the escape of our compatriots. I am not aware of the figures on the crossings back and forth.

What else? It is necessary to eliminate the institutions that engage in the preparation and dissemination of disinformation within the country and abroad. This is a dangerous thing. It flourished under the conditions of Stalinism and still exists to this day. Finally, one more aspect: The KGB has the potential means to cause harm to people's health and lives. This potential was also created under Stalin and still exists as it was with full volume. Why? For what purposes? To murder political enemies?

[Moroz] Are these means really being used?

[Kalugin] I do not know of any cases in the past two or three years, but before that they were. These include psychotropic and other means of disabling a person and making him a cripple. And, if necessary, getting rid of him altogether. I would immediately open up all archives through 1954 inclusively—I would give the Yezhov-Beria-Stalin archives to the historians and let them straighten it all out. I think more recent archives should also be opened, albeit gradually and selectively.

[Zagalskiy] ARGUMENTY I FAKTY recently printed some questions from readers and answers from the KGB press center. Among other answers was the assertion that nonstaff informers are not paid and there is no such item of expenditures; they are merely given assistance sometimes, say, in obtaining an apartment, buying an automobile, and so forth. Is this true?

[Kalugin] That is nonsense. As the first deputy chief of the Leningrad KGB administration, I myself signed finance documents which paid for the services rendered by these people. It is another matter that they were relatively small sums of 20 or 30 a month. That is one thing. It is a different thing that the payment is irregular—say, once a quarter. But the payment exists. As for assistance—that is actually mandatory. To obtain an apartment or get a pass. These are their material incentives.

[Zagalskiy] It is thought that almost all prostitutes paid in hard currency are in the KGB service...

[Kalugin] No, that is not true. The KGB rarely resorts to the services of prostitutes. Most frequently they use women of a higher level who are "placed" with someone—say, an ambassador or military attache. Prostitutes are drawn more to the militia than to the KGB.

[Moroz] When I was in Lithuania I repeatedly heard that certain groups were being sent into this republic in order to organize provocations and disturbances, and to arouse feelings of mistrust in the people and so forth. Is there any basis for these rumors? What tasks have been set for the KGB with respect to Lithuania and other republics where certain undesirable events are ripening or are taking place. Why do you think the bloody events in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia were not prevented?

[Kalugin] I cannot say anything about Lithuania since by the time of the Lithuanian events I had already retired.

But I can speak about the approach to situations of this kind as a whole. In the first place the KGB was never oriented to work in such situations. In the second place you must take into account the unique position of state security committees of the national republics: Many of them, especially in places where the people's fronts are strong, have joined with the leaders of these organizations, whether it be in the Baltic area, Azerbaijan, or certain other republics. For this reason the USSR KGB sent very large groups of workers of the central apparatus—hundreds of people—to all the main hotspots of the republics. But their role absolutely does not correspond to the nature of the events taking place—they are simply powerless. Imagine: A group of Russians has come, say, to Azerbaijan. The backbone of the local committee is made up of Azeris. They work with the population, they know the customs and traditions, not to mention the language. Those who arrive inevitably end up in isolation. Their work is completely ineffective. They are simply exhausted by inactivity.

Providing for security through mass dispatch of personnel—this is typically the Soviet system. Not intelligence but numbers. They would send people and report to the Central Committee: "We have taken measures"—"Ah, you have taken measures? Wonderful!" Everyone is reassured. And just go into the KGB building during a period of crisis situations. Like the events in Tbilisi and Baku. The entire committee will spend the night in their offices. They will sleep on their couches and folding beds. Why do they do this? As if this will make things easier in Baku or Sumgait or Fergana... It is a simple inability to organize work, which requires operational literacy and courage in decisionmaking. And, if you will, it is the incompetence of party leaders, for whom taking measures means mass actions, a call, or a declaration. And here one needs an intelligent approach, especially when resolving ethnic issues and preventing the spilling of blood. But one must find certain forces on which one can rely, rally them, set them against the extremists, and isolate the extremists. After all, the KGB has everything it needs—power, people, technology. Nothing of the kind is taking place. They are absolutely not dealing with the domestic political situation. Now is the time when it is necessary to slap somebody's hands—Kalugin's or someone else's—and they are quick to do this.

Revival of Stalinist Tendencies Seen

PM1710153690 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by Vyacheslav Lukashevich under the "Seven Days" rubric: "What Were the Thoughts of the Sheep Slaughtered at G. Aliyev's Feet"]

[Text] Not all our readers may have noticed the INTERFAX report which popped up in IZVESTIYA in September: "There was a meeting in a settlement in Dzhulfinskiy Rayon, Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], between local residents and Geydar Aliyev, former member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who is running for the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet. The residents gave their fellow countryman a warm greeting and according to the ancient Azerbaijani custom made a sacrifice: A sheep was slaughtered at Aliyev's feet."

Geydar Alirzy ogly Aliyev, personal pensioner of union status—as he was officially registered—was elected people's deputy for Negramskiy District No. 340 uncontested, winning 98 percent of the vote in the election. So I am entitled to congratulate the supporters of Geydar Aliyevich—as we were accustomed to call him during his tenure in office as a Politburo member—today on the 67-year old pensioner's return to the political scene.

This particular fact in general inspires thoughts about the future progression of perestroyka and the regrouping of political forces of late. Nostalgic voices have begun to be heard with increasing frequency in our society talking about old times and the "firm hand" which could allegedly drag us all out of the abyss that has formed. This trend is developing. Carefully choosing their moment, disgraced politicians are rushing to join the ranks of the "fighters" for power.

What does G. Aliyev, former leader of Azerbaijan, now living in Moscow, need with the republic's new parliament? Will he be satisfied with his seat in the conference hall or will he be "lured" by his familiar seat on the presidium? Will his outmoded, unpopular ideological orientation infuse fresh spirit into perestroyka? All these are by no means rhetorical questions.

Turdakun Usubaliyev, ex-leader of Kirghizia, who led the republic for almost 25 years, has made his presence known in Frunze. By starting to publish chapters of his memoirs in SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, the former politician is hoping to join the game for real...

Another has-been—Dinmukhamed Kunayev—is also surfacing on this wave. Our Alma-Ata correspondent asked senior officials at the Presidential Council and the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee to comment on this phenomenon. They noted that both Kunayev's nomination as people's deputy and other actions in his defense are quite possible. The facts that have been made public indicate that his transgressions are less significant than those of Rashidov and Aliyev. During his leadership Kunayev "did a great deal of good," so his popularity in the republic is increasing.

D.A. Kunayev said this in the oblast newspaper OGNI ALATAU: "People have associated all the negative phenomena in the life of the republic's party organization with my name alone, with my activity alone, forgetting that our party's Central Committee entrusted me for a long time with work at major industrial enterprises, at scientific establishments, and in party and soviet organs. I always endeavored to honestly fulfill my party and human duty."

So who is next?

"History does not preclude zigzags," L.M. Kaganovich, who was silent for many years, recently made this comment in an interview with Italy's LA REPUBBLICA.

I hope that this assertion by Stalin's last "comrade in arms" will stop readers asking the following question: Why did this observer take it into his head to beat out the old dust from what is by no means the carpet-clad path of perestroyka? There are certainly more pressing problems. For instance, the transition to the market, which Communists discussed this week at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. The plenum participants' concern not to turn the country into the "borderland of world civilization" is understandable. But the union parliament is still, as one of our readers wrote, dragging its feet, and no one knows what will happen at the Supreme Soviet 15 October—the day scheduled for the adoption of a decision and definite programs for the transition. The "500 days," already "squandered," seem to have lost their topicality. Of course, there are also other problems. But, in my view, the problem of which direction the "path" of our political reform will take in the future is of no small importance.

Both extreme right-wingers and extreme left-wingers have strained the spring of pluralism to its greatest possible limits, and at any moment it will snap and deal a painful blow to one of the sides. Aggression is growing in some regions of the country with regard to socialism, the CPSU, V.I. Lenin, and the center. While calling for the depoliticization of the Army and law-enforcement organs, the most zealous representatives of pro-nationalist and other anti-Soviet social organizations in fact want to assert repoliticization. People in the Baltic are brandishing separatist and neofascist banners. The gathering of fascists in Tori which, as you will remember, did not take place has a sequel. It is planned to hold the constituent conference of the notorious "Kaitseliit"—a military organization and former accomplice of the fascists during the war years—in Tartu 20 October. People in Lithuania are rehabilitating the "forest brothers," whose hands were greatly stained with the blood of both the multinational Soviet Army and Lithuanians themselves, attempting to give them their "due" in pension provision. The blackguard Stepan Bandera—during his service with the Hitlerites he appeared in the Abwehr's card index as "Seryy," "Malyy," "Baba," and "Orskiy"—is being "revived" in the Western Ukraine. The Independent Ukrainian Youth League is collecting donations under black-and-red and blue-and-yellow flags in Ivano-Frankovsk and Lvov Oblasts for a monument to the resurrected "hero."

Realities are such that I could add to this list. But one can conclude from these facts that a certain section of society is in the grip of ideas remote from perestroyka—as most Soviet people understand it—ideas in contravention of panhuman values, humanization, and socialist guidelines. Moreover, take note, it is not only emblems and idols that are being raked out of old trunks but also the methods of fighting for power that were tried in the past and condemned in world consciousness.

Methods which, incidentally, totally preclude all democratization.

What is this—inability to face the future, or a "zigzag" where long-forgotten elements of the old system are presented as new? However negative our attitude toward the ideologization of human relations today, there is a clash of ideologies and political positions under way. For want of progressive, contemporary ideological guidelines and on account of their inability to propose any, some people who have "emerged from obscurity" have taken on board the old guidelines that were tested by the former "leaders" ["vozhdi"]—and not without some success.

It is not surprising either that portraits of the generalissimo [Stalin] have once again "sprung up" on the windshields of "Avtotrans" trucks arriving in Moscow by the southern roads. The national arrogance of some of Georgia's representatives refuses to follow the example set by Tengiz Abuladze, one of the first to deal a cinematographic blow to the "idols" in his "Repentance." Academician I. Dzhordzhadze of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences has become head of a far from ordinary society which eulogizes the name of Stalin. At present this small "Stalin" society, which has assumed the status of an international society, has secured the right via the republic's Supreme Court to participate with 35 political parties and public organizations in the elections of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet. During a conversation with our Tbilisi correspondent, Irakliy Ivanovich said: "I am sure that if you give us just five years and a Stalinist constitution we will restore the country. We will extricate it from the crisis." The academician only fails to say how many gulags have to be reconstructed and how many "enemies of the people" executed for this to occur.

As we can see Stalinist philosophy is today interwoven with the philosophy of political pluralism, while precluding pluralism and democracy as such.

Reader, fresh flowers adorn the bust of L.I. Brezhnev in Dneprodzerzhinsk. An exhibition opened here recently entitled "...And to Leonid Ilich Personally," displaying the former general secretary's gifts from party and state organs, public organizations, and citizens—119 exhibits in total.

Still, what is the reason for the headline to this article? What were the thoughts of the poor sheep? It is perhaps difficult to accurately convey the thoughts of the wretched creature. But with his animal instinct he may have remembered that his great-grandfather was also slaughtered at the feet of this man who is held in high esteem by his fellow countrymen. The sheep may have thought: "Good God! The boss is back!"

However, a sheep is a sheep. He could, of course, have been mistaken.

Minister Reports Rail Strikes Called Off

914H0022A Moscow GUDOK in Russian 16 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by N.S. Konarev, minister of Railways: "Let Us Combine our Efforts"]

[Text] **The Second Plenum of the Central Committee of the Independent Trade Union of Railroad Workers and Transport Construction Workers was held on 13 October. The Collegium and administration directors of the Ministry of Railways took part in its work.**

The plenum adopted a resolution not to carry out the strikes slated for 15 and 25 October. This occurred because of the basically valid position occupied by the work collectives of the railroad transport enterprises, and Decree No 1000, adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers on 11 October 1990, "On Measures To Stabilize Railroad Transport Work," of which you have been informed. A number of comments, which were perceived as self-critical, were addressed to the Collegium.

In giving a high evaluation to the solidity of the overwhelming majority of the work collectives in banning the strikes, the Collegium of the Ministry of Railways expresses its gratitude to the production collectives, trade union and other social organizations. At the same time, the Collegium confirms its full resolve to achieve unconditional fulfillment of Decree No. 1000 of the USSR Council of Ministers, and to intensify the attention paid to solving problems concerning the satisfaction of the railroad workers' social needs.

The Collegium hopes that the railroad transport workers will also, in the future, display their unity and solidarity in ensuring normal transport work. Now, through combined efforts, measures must be taken toward a considerable improvement in work.

Rail Transport Decree Highlighted

914H0022B Moscow GUDOK in Russian 13 Oct 90 p 1

[Article: "Measures To Stabilize Railroad Transport Work"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers, by Decree No. 1000 of 11 October 1990, "On Measures To Stabilize Railroad Transport Work," in order to ensure stable railroad transport work under the conditions of the transition of the national economy to a market economy, the development of the material-technical base and the social sphere of the sector, and intensification of the guarantees of the work rights of the railroad workers:

1. Approved the Program of Technical Re-Equipment and Modernization of USSR Railroads in 1991-2000.

2. Asks the USSR Supreme Soviet to accelerate the examination and adoption of the draft of the Law on Railroad Transport at the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, putting it into effect beginning on 1 January 1991.

3. Has introduced the following changes in the Regulations on Discipline of USSR Railroad Transport Workers, approved by Decree No 748 of the USSR Council of Ministers of 7 August 1985 (USSR SP, 1985, No 24, p 123 of the Order of the Ministry of Railways of 15 August 1985, No 33Ts):

a) To set forth paragraph 6 of item 24 in the following wording:

"Workers are dismissed by agreement with the trade union committee, with the exception of cases specified by USSR legislation";

b) Item 41 is set forth in the following wording:

"41. Labor disputes of workers on problems of imposing disciplinary punishment are examined, in accordance with the procedure established by law, by committees for labor disputes, the trade union committees of enterprises, institutions and organizations, and by rayon (city) people's courts.

"At the worker's desire, a complaint about unlawful, just as about incorrect imposition of disciplinary punishment, or violation by the director of the actual regulations established by him, or non-fulfillment by him of his duties, is examined by higher directors";

c) Item 42 is recognized as having lost force;

d) Items 43 and 44 are accordingly regarded as items 42 and 43.

4. Considering the specific nature of railroad transport work conditions, safety requirements and the need for the continuous functioning of the national economy, the USSR Ministry of Justice and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, with the participation of interested organizations, are commissioned to draw up and present for approval to the USSR Council of Ministers, before 1 December 1990, the draft of the regulations on discipline of railroad transport workers, bearing in mind, when putting it into effect, beginning on 1 January 1991, that the Regulations on Discipline of USSR Railroad Transport Workers are to be repealed.

5. Has entrusted USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Food and Purchases, the USSR Ministry of Trade and the governments of the union republics with working out, with the participation of the USSR Ministry of Railways, and carrying out specific measures for stable provision with material-technical resources of the enterprises and organizations of railroad transport and for improvement of the foodstuff supply for railroad workers. For problems requiring a resolution of the USSR government, the appropriate proposals are to be presented to the USSR Council of Ministers before 1 December 1990.

6. Has obliged the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Railways and the governments of the union republics to take urgent measures to eliminate

cases of blocking and picketing railroad lines and decisively cut off illegal displays directed at disrupting railroad activity.

7. Has obliged the USSR Ministry of Railways, railroad chiefs and the directors of enterprises and organizations to take additional measures to reinforce discipline in railroad transport. Widescale explanatory work is to be carried out in the production collectives on the inadmissibility, in accordance with the USSR Law on the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes, of using strikes against transport as a means of solving labor conflicts.

Trains on Moscow-Leningrad Line Collide

914H0018A Moscow GUDOK in Russian 16 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by V. Yurasov and N. Davydov: "A Wreck at Kulitskaya"]

[Text] **One person was killed and 9 persons were hospitalized (of them, five were passengers) as the result of a wreck that occurred on 14 October on the Moscow-Leningrad Mainline.**

At 5 a.m., freight train No 2302 was accepted on the 4th track of the Kulitskaya Station, in order to release the main track for the Moscow-Leningrad Express, No 30, following close behind. For reasons so far unclear, one of the rear tank cars derailed, dragging after it the second one, which blocked off the neighboring main track. The passenger consist, traveling at a speed of about 80 kilometers an hour, ran into it.

As a result of the collision, the electric locomotive, another six tank cars and six of the leading cars of the express train ended up on the shoulder. The traffic disruption along the first main track alone lasted over 18 hours, which delayed dozens of passenger and freight consists.

The restoration work, in which breakdown trains from Khovrina, Kalinin and Vologoye participated, was hampered by the fact that highly inflammable liquid—pyropolymer—was leaking from the derailed tank cars. This necessitated particular caution in raising the rolling stock and repairing the rails.

It must particularly be emphasized that, due to the skillful work of the local civil defense units, the fire protection management and the organs of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], there was no combustion.

The USSR Railroad Safety Fund decided to assist the family of N. Asadoin, the passenger train conductor who perished, in the amount of 1000 rubles.

MOSCOW NEWS on PRAVDA Editors' 'Mutiny'

PM1910155490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 41, 21-28 Oct 90 p 3

[Dmitriy Kazutin article: "Mutiny on Board?"]

[Text] Sensational news swept over Moscow last week. The editors of Pravda were said to be demanding independence. It seemed incredible. It was quite logical that Literaturnaya Gazeta journalists should seek a break from the USSR Writers' Union and become independent founders of their newspaper, or that the Ogonek weekly, which had long proved its political independence, should strive after economic independence. But why Pravda?

Millions of Pravda readers familiar with the newspaper's "private life" often found its editors' attitude to perestroika strange. Many remembered the sharp editorial, "Purification", published just before the 27th CPSU Congress. At that point the readers got the impression Pravda would take the lead in reforming the mass media and engage in the "last decisive battle" against party bureaucracy. It did indeed prove to be the last battle. Since then Pravda has been conservative through and through.

Viktor Afanasyev's resignation as Editor-in-Chief and the appointment of Ivan Frolov revived hopes for change. But time went by and nothing materialized.

In the meantime, what had been the "unofficial" press was not legalized by the Law on the Press and offered serious competition to well-established publications. The newspaper market put the central—and local—CPSU-controlled publications to the test, along with the CPSU itself.

The rescinding of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution has had important consequences for the communist press in this country. The 28th CPSU Congress Resolution about the CPSU-controlled mass media did not give the usual emphasis to the directive nature of the party press, which, paradoxically, had been its main attraction. People always read Pravda in order to know what the authorities wanted from them, preferring to have this vital information from the horse's mouth. Pravda was needed both by enthusiastic supporters of authoritarian power and by its secret or open opponents.

Pravda had its own stereotypes. After each party congress it would promote its decisions. After each Central Committee plenum it did the same.

Following the 28th CPSU Congress the clock-work precision of the party-controlled mass media began to falter. It has become obvious that the congress failed to outline the direction of further progress clearly enough. Likewise, it failed to make a clear-cut choice between the conservatives and the advocates of reform. This uncertainty resulted in a feeling of constraint or lack of freedom in the party press, and eventually in the party membership itself. Rank-and-file members reacted by handing in their party cards. Party newspapers reacted differently.

Rabochaya Tribuna confined itself to slight changes in its log. Calling itself "the newspaper for the social protection of the working people", it transferred all mention of its sponsor—the CPSU Central Committee—to the back page.

Claimed by the supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, Sovetskaya Rossiya chose to acknowledge the exclusive ownership rights of the CPSU (more specifically, the Communist Party of the Russian Federation) on the one hand—and to swear its allegiance to the principles of perestroika on the other.

As for Pravda itself, the staff held a two-day party meeting during which speakers demanded that Ivan Frolov resign, that several editors be re-elected and that the future of the newspaper be discussed by a special Central Committee plenum.

Since a number of regional party newspapers demanded to be emancipated from the rule of local party secretaries and Sovetskaya Rossiya journalists opposed the political line of their editors, one could interpret the Pravda situation in the same light.

I would prefer to avoid hasty conclusions and suppose that the instigators of the "mutiny" on board the press flagship pursued a single objective: to replace Ivan Frolov at the helm.

Said to be "Gorbachev's man", Ivan Frolov has failed to establish a close link between Pravda and the President, who still remains CPSU General Secretary. Distanced from the centre of power, the Pravda editors began playing by ear, for the most part relying on their old allegiances. In the absence of Ligachev, they seem to have found an adequate substitute in Polozkov. That's why, I think, both conservatives and reformers took part in the mutiny. Both groups craved clarity.

At the same time, one gets the impression that Pravda is becoming increasingly opposed to democratic power structures, especially Rusian ones. This opposition might open a new chapter in the history of the communist press in the Soviet Union—and make a logical sequel to its former directive and authoritarian role in our society. Pravda seems to be designing a new behavioural model for the CPSU-controlled media, and consequently, for the entire party.

New Prices for Newspaper Announced

PM1910085590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed IZVESTIYA announcement]

[Text] Only until 1 November is it possible to subscribe to IZVESTIYA for any period.

As has already been announced, the annual subscription to IZVESTIYA will rise to 22.56 rubles [R] in 1991. Our number is 50050.

This is due to the considerable increase in expenditure on paper and printing services and distribution costs. Even at such a high price, revenue from the paper will be less than one-eighth of the usual amount, which shows that we do not intend to make subscribers bear the entire burden.

There is another change. Next year we plan to publish six times a week—eight pages on three days and six pages on three days. This corresponds to the current number of pages in a week.

We would point out that you can subscribe to the paper for a shorter period—six months, three months, and even one month, and then extend the subscription. The respective costs will be R11.28, R5.64, and R1.88.

We would remind our readers that subscription ends 31 October.

As for the weekly SOYUZ, published by the IZVESTIYA Publishing House, the cost of an annual subscription will be R20.80 and the price of a single issue will be 60 kopecks on the street. The weekly NEDELYA will continue to be sold only on the street, but it will now cost 40 kopecks per issue.

Continuing Media Censorship Reported

91US0029A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by A. Illesh and V. Rudniv: "Censorship Has Been Abolished, but the Censors Remain—An Attempt To Review a Book on State Secrets"]

[Text] The reason for writing this article was the arrival at the editorial office of a document with the long and boring title "On Changes to the 1990 Edition of 'The List of Information Forbidden for Publication.'"

In our time—the time of glasnost and perestroyka—this paper looks somewhat strange. But this document is very real—it has a long seven-figure number, as well as the word "secret" carefully stamped in black. This two-page work was published 22 days after the Law on the Press, eliminating (supposedly) censorship on the territory of the USSR, went into effect. The circulation of the secret amendment, also of some interest, is 20,000 copies (Either there are that many thousands of censors in the USSR, or there is a whole army of chiefs who are entrusted with secrets. But in any case, a "secret" circulated in this fashion is a fiction). But these instructions are intended, as formerly, to serve as a bridle for especially zealous journalists.

Two, just two little pages from a thick, secret book on secrets—that is the catechism each censor must check with. What new things must we not know?

Well, for example we (and, probably, the readers) must not learn the facts and figures about outbreaks of hoof-and-mouth disease caused by an exotic type of virus among livestock, of plague and contagious pleuropneumonia among horned cattle, of African plague and

Venezuelan encephalomyelitis among horses, of Rift Valley fever and Nairobi disease among sheep...

And now that censorship of the mass media has been banned, what will a free press look like? After all, this is the subject of the USSR Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media." Executing the will of the legislators, the USSR Council of Ministers acknowledged that the regulations for Glavlit [Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press] have lapsed, and it created another office—the Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press and Other Mass Media (GUOT). And the newborn department has begun work and is sending the aforementioned document to editorial boards.

Thus, through the simple trick of changing the sign out front—it was USSR Glavlit, it has become USSR GUOT—it has succeeded in doing legally what would seem to be impossible: There is no censorship, but the censors remain.

We will try now to analyze whether we have censorship in our country or not.

But first, several words on secrecy in general.

...At this very moment in this article we are naming "secret" facts and citing "secret" documents, and we are worrying whether the appropriate organs may bring us to court. Are we not infringing on the interests of the state, and hence on your and our interests, with this material? Is not such honesty worse (true, it is not clear for whom it would be worse)? But the absurdity is that we are forced to quote documents with the frightening classification stamp on them even as we seriously wish to know why such "secret" documents are being sent to the editorial office in the first place.

Journalists understand when they are requested to keep the source of information secret but not the information itself. And we will preserve such a secret—the Law on the Press granted that official right. But how are we to act when, obliged by the nature of our service to inform people of all that we know, we receive secret information, information "not for publication"? This is not information that has been stolen or bought or secretly photographed on microfilm; it has reached the editorial office by completely official channels or has been obtained through journalistic research. Should it all be tucked away in a trunk somewhere? Or, risking a scandal, should we fulfill our official duty and publish it? And what kind of a scandal are we talking about? This is no joking matter—revelation of secret information is punishable by incarceration for five to eight years!

It was easier before. We were not tormented by such fears. All information, before becoming available to the newspaper, passed through the censor's office—Glavlit—where it was decided that either the reader could or could not learn of it. As a result the newspapers and television were filled with features on successes in the construction of developed socialism, and we—the journalists—were insulated from any kind of unpleasantness. The main thing was that it was impossible to "divulge" anything with this kind of monitoring over what was written—without the authorizing stamp of the censor, the newspaper did not get the order to print the material.

Today it is a different matter. Write everything that you know, and they will print it. The censor's authorization is supposedly not required: Censorship has been abolished. On the other hand, there are now criminal cases for the revelation of state secrets using the mass media. True, so far there has only been one—O. Kalugin, the disgraced ex-general. But, as they say, the foundation has been laid.

And in any case, what are journalists supposed to do with secrets and "information not for publication"?

These days many people are speaking and writing about the fight against crime. Using the latest vocabulary, we are called upon to "mobilize" the people for this affair. The subject is extremely timely. And it would seem that people have the right to know what kind of crime exists, what they are specifically supposed to fight, what means the state is proposing for this... But it seems that not everyone is supposed to know.

We continue quoting the secret document that arrived at our editorial board. There it states that it is forbidden to publish composite information about the unsatisfactory state of military discipline among personnel of the USSR Armed Forces or the situation with crime, convictions, and extraordinary occurrences (murder, suicide, injury, death, mutilation of people, maiming, desertion, theft of arms and military equipment, violation of guard duty rules, and the manifestation of group dissatisfaction by servicemen) by unit, military educational institution, and military higher educational institution.

What is the sense of this kind of "military secret"? It simply seems that an office—in this case the leadership of the military—is not at all interested in having people learn the truth about crime there. And so they thought up this paragraph of the censor's book—data about their own Soviet Army are kept secret from the people.

It is perhaps easier to understand, for instance, classification of geometric volumes of underground stores of helium, a strategic product (it also is mentioned in the document we are quoting) or of the inventory of locomotives in the country as a whole—this is probably in the interests of defense capability, although we are convinced that fully half of these locomotives do not run—they are broken down. But why are data concerning the deterioration and production of rolling stock for the USSR Ministry of Railways secret? So that we will not know what kind of risk we are taking? And can it still be a secret when we ride trains and electric trains every day and experience that same rolling stock ourselves?..

And why do we keep outbreaks of odd illnesses in sheep, horses, and horned cattle secret from our own people? So that we will not know what we are eating? Or are there defense interests here as well? However, we could quote this "book" endlessly.

Questions, question, questions... There are no precise answers for them. Because whenever we ask "why," the bureaucrat only has one answer—I cannot say: It is a state secret.

And now we have come to one more secret: What is a state secret? Unfortunately, USSR laws do not define it. Just as we do not have laws regulating the safeguarding of state and other secrets. There are only entries in the legal encyclopedic dictionary. For lack of anything better, we will quote it: "A state secret is information of a military, economic, and political nature having important state significance and specially guarded by the state. In the USSR a list of information which comprises the state's secrets is established by the USSR Council of Ministers with regard to the interests of safeguarding economic might, defense capability, and the foreign security of the USSR."

But in fact who should be defining that same list of state secrets? The popular opinion is that it should be the Council of Ministers, that is to say the executive organ of state power. There is, of course, a certain logic in this thinking. After all, a secret is transient: Today some information is secret, and tomorrow many people already know about it and there is no need to safeguard it any more. And that means that the list itself is in constant motion—some information is taken off it, and other information, on the contrary, is entered on it. And the Council of Ministers would be the ideal organ for such work. On the one hand it has the responsibility and the authorization, and on the other hand it is fairly effective.

But this is also the main snag. The Council of Ministers always has a door open to departmental interests. If an office wants to make a secret out of something that is an embarrassment to it, it need only ask. Had the Council of Ministers put its "okay" on the request, all of atomic energy and the victims of Chernobyl would have become very big secrets...

We are convinced that only the legislative power has the right to declare something a state secret—the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the Union republics, not the executive power, specifically the ministries and departments. The consequences of hiding information from people is too serious to entrust it to bureaucratic strategists. Today the interests of the government and the citizens diverge too much (unfortunately this is the reality of these days) to count only on the departments. And whatever other shortages exist, we have accumulated enough secrets over the last 70 years to start exporting them.

These secrets need review. A thorough review, using the services of the body of deputies, the mass media, and the citizens, for whose welfare, properly speaking, secrets are established.

But, unfortunately, what we have said above is just theory. In practice everything is different. Here is a quote from another document which our editorial board received. It has a different, more "intelligent," heading: "Not for publication": "The USSR GUOT, in accordance with the tasks entrusted to it... is devising and publishing on the basis of constitutional norms and existing legislation (what legislation?—author) a list of information forbidden for publication... Outdated limitations on the publication of information are abolished in accordance with established procedure (what procedure?—author)..."

As you see, it is not the Council of Ministers establishing secrets but, as before, the departments. Glavlit-GUOT is at the head. And they are not subject to any kind of freedom of the press or glasnost. Because (repeating what has been said above) we have no law on state secrets and no laws regulating their preservation. Because we continue to wander about in the familiar realm of a state not governed by the rule of law: Everything that is not permitted is forbidden.

...By the way, they say that a draft law on state secrecy does nonetheless exist. Of course, its location is also a secret. And so long as there are no public safeguards for us, Glavlit-GUOT will be all-powerful and censorship will remain a trusted weapon in the hands of the department chiefs.

We foresee an objection: Glavlit-GUOT is not as we describe it. It only "exists on a contractual basis for examination and consultation on material disseminated via the press and other mass media with the goal of revealing information in it that is forbidden for publication; in the event that such information is observed, the leaders of the organs of the press and other mass media are informed of it." This is how the new functions of the censorship organ are described in the provisional regulations.

But "consultation" presupposes the right of choice. Yes, an editor can make use of the services of the censor or he can refuse them. But the problem is that in the absence of a law on state secrecy we are "bound" hand and foot. The entire issue is that same "List of Information Forbidden for Publication" with which this article began. This book is secret. Only the censors have it. And the only opportunity for following that list in our work is to conclude an agreement with GUOT. And previously the censor of our articles was at least free of charge; now the editorial office (in other words, you, respected subscribers) will have to pay for the "loyalty" of its own articles.

This new tax could be called a tax on "trustworthiness"...

Communists Ask End to 'Mockery' of Lenin

PM1810081590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

[Letter to editorial office and appeal to the country's citizens from party secretaries of government departments' party organizations, published as part of the "Recent Mail" feature]

[Text] Esteemed Editorial Office!

Party committees writing on behalf of communists from the primary party organizations of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry, the USSR Ministry of Railways, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the USSR State Committee for Statistics, and the USSR Ministry of Transport Construction ask you to publish in your newspaper the enclosed text of an appeal to communists and to all honest people in the country in defense of V.I. Lenin.

(Signed] Party Committee secretaries: A. Grishanov, N. Myakoshin, M. Podkolzin, A. Pavlov, O. Biryukov, S. Ponurin.

Appeal from Communists to All the Country's Citizens

The development of democratization, begun on the initiative of the Communist Party, has led to the awakening of society's civic responsibility for the country's future and the broad involvement of all its strata in law-making activity, the running of the state, and the formation of public opinion.

At the same time, individual groupings that are emerging in the struggle for power during the formation of a multiparty system are mounting an anticommunist campaign, doing nothing but criticize the negative aspects of our activity, and slandering and dishonoring the post-October period of our history and the memory of V.I. Lenin.

Yesterday, these "patrons" of democracy glorified Lenin's ideas in their pursuit of transient political gain with the aim of advancing in their jobs and receiving material wealth and privileges. They are not interested in the real history of the country and the people's serious problems. Certain forces are pursuing power at any price on the wave of democracy so that they can suppress it later.

The most sacred thing is at stake today: Should the Land of the Soviets exist?

We Communists who defend the ideas of Lenin and the October Revolution are prepared to cooperate with all progressive parties and movements on the basis of consensus and not confrontation.

We appeal for an end to the outrages and vandalism against the sacred monuments to V.I. Lenin and the closing of museums and historical places connected with Lenin.

We appeal to the electorate and all the country's citizens to demand that their people's deputies put an end to the mockery and jeering of Lenin's name and end the anticommunist, antidemocratic campaign.

We ask USSR President Comrade M.S. Gorbachev to use his absolute power and authority to establish order and adopt radical measures for the protection of the national wealth and culture that has been created in our country and that is being destroyed on the pretext of freedom of thought and democracy. We expect the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviets to **openly express** their viewpoint on this issue.

On the eve of the 73d anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, we appeal to all communists and citizens who cherish our motherland, socialism, and social justice, to defend Lenin and the Land of the Soviets in a united front, and show their solidarity during the 7 November demonstration.

Adopted in the party organizations of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry, the USSR Ministry of Railways, the USSR Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the USSR Committee for Statistics, and the USSR Ministry of Transport Construction.

Moscow, Sokolnicheskiy Rayon

Economic

PRAVDA Commentary on Economic Guidelines

PM1910143090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Aleksandr Nikitin "Commentary for the Issue": "Historic Time, Economic Space"]

[Text] Problems of economic development in our country have probably never before been discussed as pointedly and dramatically as during these October days. Need and necessity, reason and emotion sometimes appear to change places. Time does not give us windows in order to look back and cool down after a debate, to comprehensively comprehend what is happening, and to take the next step toward the market.

However, the reader will say, perestroyka began quite a long time ago. "Why does the party not have its own economic program?" the workers of Leningrad's Kirovskiy Plant asked quite recently. The party expressed its attitude to this at the Central Committee plenum. In crisis situations, according to G.A. Yavlinskiy, who recently resigned as deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, the government and the political leadership must rely on competent specialists and the solutions offered by them. And it is up to the authorities to adopt them or not. It is hard to disagree with this, for no radical solutions could dispense with the participation of science and scientists. But it is probably impossible to agree that the broad discussion of what is essentially such a crucial turn in the life of the country is a matter only for a narrow circle of people. For society needs not just a program and information but a profound conviction as to the rightness of the steps being taken on the path of the socialist choice.

Today the cause is clearly being held up by the indecisiveness and confusion of the organs of power. On which program are we to make our choice and adopt a decision? As the "Basic Guidelines for the Stabilization of the National Economy and the Transition to a Market Economy," published yeaterday, point out, it was difficult to begin perestroyka without political reforms, without extending democratization and glasnost. The synthesized document sent by President M.S. Gorbachev to the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet contains a broad view of the problems and the solutions offered to parliament.

The chief aim of the economic program (or of its basic guidelines) is to extricate the country from "stagnation" by means of perestroyka. Let us state bluntly that it seems unusual today to read lines about "stagnation" in the sixth year of perestroyka. But this phrase expresses the true situation and a sober assessment of it. Yes, vigorous measures are needed first to stabilize the economy by relying on public concord and then to advance more rapidly toward the market.

But it is not enough to sing a hymn to the market, pinning all hopes on it. We are faced with making a difficult study of the market, a study which has not been known for at least two or three generations of people and which we will all be obliged to go through, from antiilliteracy circles to universities, from primitive failures to world parameters of economic progress. And this socio-psychological change and schooling will, at the same time, probably be no less complex than society's legal, organizational steps on the paths of the market economy.

Public concord as the chief condition for drawing up the optimum market program is, of course, still very unstable. This can be judged from recent statements by a number of prominent leaders in the Russian parliament. The struggle between different views and the revelation of nuances is a natural phenomenon under such conditions in the life of society. But the concord reached in economic ideas the previous day yielded fruit. For the Basic Guidelines are founded on the programs jointly drawn up by the working group of M.S. Gorbachev, B.N. Yeltsin, and the government. Account was taken of the proposals made at previous sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Union republics.

Need it be said that not all the proposals and wishes could be fully reflected in the document? What was more important was their essence and the areas and concepts which the USSR Supreme Soviet will examine during these days. Of particular importance are such key provisions as forming through the all-Union market a unified economic space integrating all the republics and regions. It is the transition to the market that will make it possible to create the economic basis for the voluntary unification of sovereign republics within the framework of the renewed Union.

On reading the document you cannot help thinking: Was G.A. Yavlinskiy not too hasty in resigning? The president proposes to examine specifically the thesis of the state's renunciation of direct participation in economic activity, except, of course, for individual special spheres. Market mechanisms of self-regulation and a balanced economy are regarded as of paramount importance. Privatization of property or, more simply, its acquisition by specific owners is encouraged. The important social role of the most active, competent, and talented people is recognized.

The program is of a Union nature. But this certainly does not mean that each sovereign republic can do without its own package of measures for the transition to the market. I believe that this will be a topical amendment to the former centralism and the uniformity of decisions. For each republic has its own economic and social conditions and national and historical features. It is important to protect consumers' interests against unscrupulous competition and to raise people's living standards. For this it is necessary, above all, to equalize the starting conditions for the republics' transition to new forms of ownership and to market relations.

And, of course, it is no coincidence that the document gives greatest prominence to improving finances and monetary circulation. Only this is not an end in itself but a consequence of stabilizing the national economy. Holders of accounts in savings banks—from schoolchildren to pensioners—can rest assured that it is planned to protect the population's monetary savings by raising interest rates on investments. But the most important thing is to expand production of goods.

But a full, exhaustive reply is hardly given to the question of how to curb the growth in prices, although this task has been set. It is proposed to end the emission of money. And this at a time when the printing presses of the Main Administration for Production of State Bank Notes, Coins, and Medals are daily speeding up and, like the newspapers, now do not even have enough paper. I.I. Skvortsov-Stepanov joked in 1917 that when there is no longer any work at all, it will be found in Russian factories printing paper money. I would not want a repetition of that.

The program's authors pin great hopes on the creation of the USSR Reserve Banking System and on stabilization funds at enterprises. The paramount sources of the required finances are the reduction of state control, the introduction of shares, the development of commercial credit among enterprises, and their issuing of bonds.

This will reduce the orientation toward bank credit and serve as an element in the creation of a new, essentially wholesale market.

The words "enterprise" and "entrepreneur," which disappeared from our vocabulary many years ago, are returning to us. To judge from the Basic Guidelines, they are being filled with profound and specific content. It has not yet been announced, but it is soon proposed to announce free enterprise in the country, be it an organization, enterprise, or individual. And once again there is the important refrain, which we are unaccustomed to hearing, about the inadmissibility of organs of state management interfering in the life of enterprises, regardless of the forms of ownership and the principles of economic management.

It was probably difficult even in such an extensive program—and this with its submission almost in thesis form to the USSR Supreme Soviet—to take account of the whole diversity of the aspects of the transition to the market and the radical renewal of the economy. It speaks quite vaguely, in just a single line, about the receptiveness of scientific and technical progress to the market. And yet this is essentially a very important means of achieving the goal. Finance and muscle are still far from everything needed for the success of the reforms in the city and the countryside. Here, from decade to decade, we seem each time to be faced with a new virgin land.

And yet such an extensive program as this has never before been submitted for discussion by the USSR Supreme Soviet. It has to be examined comprehensively, which means that additions and amplifications to it are still to come. In this version, I believe, both the logic of economic recovery and social policy under conditions of the transition to the market, instead of frightening people with "shock therapy," provide a rich basis for businesslike creative cooperation.

And so, the people's elected representatives have the last word!

Low Standards Said To Worsen Economy

PM2210142590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Commentary by Aleksandr Nikitin: "Stop-Press Commentary": "The Invasion of the... Chervonets (ten-ruble bill), or What Statistics Say Today"]

[Text] The time for being lulled by statistics is obviously past. We all look at columns of statistical reports in alarm, rather like a diagnosis given to a patient.

Today the USSR State Committee for Statistics' [Goskomstat] nine-month report begins by speaking of a "further growth in crisis phenomena in society." The scale of production is declining, along with its efficiency. Investment policy proportions have worsened. The commissioning of important production capacities, housing, and sociocultural facilities has been frustrated. Procurements of individual agricultural goods have declined....

In short, the country's economy is in a bad way. What has caused these trends? Goskomstat economists give the main reason as being a fall in economic management standards and the disruption of economic ties and contract and labor discipline. But is that the only reason? All this is rather the result of the old outmoded and totally bureaucratic production relations. People's economic interests cannot be directed solely by means of our managerial, administrative command methods.

If contracts are not fulfilled and business ties are disrupted, it is not a matter of order, edicts, pressure, or appeals. This was what A. Baskov, a Kirghiz power grid construction worker, told us at the editorial office: "The recent order to observe delivery discipline is merely a directive which fails to take into consideration the changing economic conditions in the country. We did after all have orders and resolutions of this kind in the past. Then they were fulfilled extremely badly. Now they are totally doomed to fail. Why? Ruble inflation has rendered ordinary ties ineffective. No one wants to sell anything for rubles. We have a contract to supply truck cranes from the Kamyshinskiy plant. We send money, but they do not need it: They demand flexible trailing cables and other components that are in short supply. I think that what we need is a quite different decree on the recovery of our ruble rather than its accelerated inflation." The construction worker's idea is clear. While fighting for the freedom of market relations, we cannot speed them up by directives that retard the logical development of these relations.

How is this picture recorded in state statistics? Some 70 percent more money has been put into circulation in the first nine months of this year than for the same period last year. Clearly, it is not only flexible hoses but also hard rolled steel that is vanishing without trace in this vast bonfire of devalued chervontsy and light industry goods are vanishing like moths in the flame. And how! The population's monetary income totaled 461 billion rubles [R]—an increase of 14.4 percent. Against a plan estimate of 7.1 percent for the year. So, I would like to say that our economy is moving on from producing essential goods to producing chervontsy.

What else is increasing in our country? The population's outstanding demand rose by R19 billion, while the scale of the inflationary processes, counting price hikes and hidden inflation (to be correct, virtually overt inflation), totaled more than nine percent in the period January-September. Speculation is on the increase. Admittedly, consumer goods worth R336.2 billion at retail prices have been produced in this period, which represents an increase of R20 billion (six percent). But this is, unfortunately, considerably lower than the indicators envisaged in the state plan (14 percent).

The invasion of the chervonets is of course affecting different spheres of the economy in different ways. The total commodity resources directed into trading outlets produced an increase in retail commodity turnover of R43.6 million, or 14.7 percent at real prices. In the opinion of the State Committee for Statistics, the fact that that its growth has been secured primarily (about 75 percent) through actual commodity deliveries is a positive factor. Strange, but what has taken the place of the one-fourth of real commodity deliveries at this time? Are they now trading simply in chits bearing contract prices?

What do we have on our tables today? The food products that reach trading outlets only meet 75 percent of the population's demand. Holdups with all types of foodstuffs have intensified at trading outlets; even goods that provided no cause for alarm in the recent past have been in short supply. Difficulties with food have been manifest with particular acuteness in Moscow, Leningrad, and other industrial centers. What are the reasons for this? Breaches of discipline by irresponsible workers again? Is everything not too simple?

In conditions when the denationalization [razgosudarstvleniye] of property in favor of labor collectives is expected (and has in some places already begun) the economic bureaucracy is still indivisibly availing itself of its rights, striving to retard this process. It does not need lease or joint-stock, much less private ownership, since under these conditions the bureaucracy is completely under the control of those who own the plant, the factory, the workshop, or the land. The market will very likely restore order and strengthen discipline.

The world is nonetheless ruled not by laws but by interests that are cherished and understood by millions of working people. Our country does indeed have millions of working people—164 million. How many will there be tomorrow?

Population growth is declining. We are even losing adults. In the first half of the year 203,800 people left for permanent residence abroad, which is higher by a factor of 2.2 than for the same period last year. Almost a third of them are under 18. Workers, employees, and kolkhoz [collective farm] workers totaled 31, 34, and two percent of the total number of emigres respectively. Internal "emigres" have also appeared in the country—refugees. There are now roughly 600,000 of them.

Let us link arms, friends, so as not to disappear one by one.... That is something we sang at one time. It was a good song. Now it is time to ponder its underlying meaning.

Moscow City Council To Introduce Food Rationing

LD2210213190 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] The Moscow City Council Presidium has approved plans to introduce food rationing in the Soviet capital. The plans will now go before the council session in November.

Food rationing is viewed as a social protection measure to accompany the country's transition to market economy. The food supplies to Moscow will be confined to the needs of the city residents. The food imported over these quotas from other regions will be sold for commercial prices.

Goods Shortages, Production Problems Viewed

PM2210120990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by S. Karkhanin on interview with G.N. Kiselev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Consumer Goods and Trade, under the rubric "Communist's Opinion"; place and date not given: "In the USSR Supreme Soviet: From Socks to Computers"—first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] There are two questions which especially perturb people today: How painful will be the effect of transition to the market on their living standards, and when will goods finally reappear in the stores. These problems, together with many others, were discussed at a meeting between V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Communist USSR people's deputies. It is well known that the country's Supreme Soviet adopted as a basis, by an absolute majority of votes, the draft document defining the economic reform strategy. But what priorities should be adopted in tactics? G.N. Kiselev, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Consumer Goods and Trade and one of the coordinators of the Communist deputies' action group, shared his views in an interview with SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's political observer.

[Kiselev] I was not planning to speak at the session, but afterwards did decide to ask for the floor. Why? In our view, the package of problems associated with the manufacture of consumer goods is still being underestimated. If we want not to slip off the plank leading to the market and to avoid social shocks, we cannot curb the production of these goods, especially of goods in daily demand and prime necessities.

The market as such will not automatically fill our shelves, and in actual fact it may even cause a drop of production at the initial stage. This means that the manufacture of goods needs a most favored status. This manufacture is now growing, even though not by much, and despite the fact that exaggerated demand and panic buying give the impression that light industry is altogether at a standstill.... True enough, there has been no growth in footwear production and imports have been cut back in the last few months. Larger quantities of hosiery articles have been shipped to the trade network, but they are still in short supply: People are stocking up.

In general, I attach fundamental importance to the idea that, all along our path to the market, the volume of manufactured basic goods, clothing, and footwear should not fall below a certain limit, so that everyone can satisfy at least his minimum needs. How is this to be achieved? First, through skillful taxation policy and benefits for those engaged in the production of prime necessities. Benefits are actually available now, but they ought to be enhanced. Second, there is a need for help as regards resources. Dozens of enterprises are up in arms because of shortages, our deputies' commission receives from them desperate letters and telegrams asking us to intervene. This is why I insist that two fundamental questions be resolved at the Council of the Federation. A political decision, coordinated with the republics' leaderships, should ensure freedom of economic contracts between regions for deliveries of raw materials for the manufacture of goods and the modernization of technology: The old technology will not take us very far.

Incidentally, the first nine months have seen a 13-percent growth in the group of goods for cultural and consumer service purposes and household articles: Conversion has started producing returns. True enough, equipment deliveries are approximately one-third less than planned. This means that the republics must support and finance the conversion program, whose aim is the technological renewal of the industry producing goods in mass demand.

There are facts testifying that some republics' leaderships are obstructing deliveries of raw materials to neighboring regions. But closing one's borders would mean stewing in one's own juice. After all, even Russia with its vast potential cannot manage without, for example, Uzbek cotton or the output of tanneries in the Transcaucasus. Nothing can be bought abroad without foreign currency, which is not available nor is it likely to be....

The key economic problem will have to be resolved by means of political accord between the republics. Then the path to the market will be smoother. Moreover, the transition period needs strict monitoring: Quite a few "loopholes" for unlawful manufacturing activities are emerging. I do not think that we should have dismantled the people's control system. Subordinating it to legislative organs and labor collectives is a different matter. After all, people's controllers could actually make sure that goods do not disappear somewhere in transit between factories, trade network warehouses, and stores. Even though the main point still is to make the producer interested in good work and to renew the economic mechanism so that sellers would find it more advantageous to trade honestly and earn profits.

Major hopes are pinned on the destatization of stores. In the conditions of scarcity, however, there are goods which are disadvantageous to trade in—cheap goods, geared to the daily needs of children and pensioners. Why is it that the bulk of shady deals nowadays involve computer sales? Simply because thousands can be "earned" from each sale. And yet, speculation with socks is futile. We believe that the stores' new masters, whoever they might be, must pledge to local organs of Soviet power that, during the transition period and in addition to all else, they will sell a certain volume of various goods in daily demand. It is obvious that, beyond the limits of the agreed minimum, the seller will be able to trade in whatever he deems necessary.

It is clear that the state trade network must be underwritten when taking on the sale of prime necessities at socially low prices. We must be especially concerned to protect the interests of people on minimum incomes. Right to the point of instituting subsidies. This is why we will be unable to manage without a union organ coordinating the state trade network. It will be necessary to create state reserves, build up stocks of goods, and make centralized purchases abroad. The "weight" of such an organ will probably be more solid in contacts with foreign partners than that of republican organs.

If we mess up the production of goods in daily demand, we will mess up the transition to the market. Elements of regulation agreed through general accord will also be necessary at this stage.

A few words about the present situation. Factories all over the country have for a long time been without cotton, while Uzbekistan was not selling it in the hope of getting hold of some foreign currency. True enough, a different situation has already emerged at the Russian wholesale trade fair. The Russian Federation assured Uzbekistan's enterprises that contracts with them will be concluded normally and it obtained cotton. And now it is failing to conclude contracts for about one-half of the items on the list.... You cannot treat your partner with disrespect—it will backfire on you tomorrow.

There are some amazing cases: Some people are breaking their established economic ties at random, without even having any fallback alternatives. Something will somehow work out, they say. Even though practice proves that the tried and tested partner is, as a rule, the most reliable. Even in Russia contracts between enterprises for 1991 are being badly concluded. For the country as a whole, the best indicator for raw material resources associated with goods manufacture is 70 percent. As for imported raw material deliveries, I am afraid that January has already been wrecked....

And so, why do our shelves remain empty even though goods are being produced? Pressure is exerted by "free" money and panic demand, the shadow economy is exacting its share, trade rules are being broken, economic mismanagement is having its effect. And the main cause lies with disrupted economic ties in the country and the decline of contractual discipline. Judging by preliminary estimates, 40 light industry enterprises will come to a standstill because of raw materials. Unless measures are taken, 300,000 persons employed in the sector could find themselves without work by year's end. And next year this number could reach 900,000! This represents one-third of the total "personnel" numbers. Let me emphasize, moreover, that we are talking primarily about women.

We are convinced that it is necessary to do everything to ensure maximum protection of the interests of ordinary working people along the path to the market and to soften the blow on their living standards. People must not suffer, and this is what we communist deputies perceive as our top-priority task.

Half of Goods Reportedly Go to Profiteers

904D0239A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by V. Pyankova: "Pseudonym of a Speculator"]

[Text] **Half of the goods of the trade network fall into the hands of profiteers.**

A large, prettily wrapped box of candy lay on the counter. In a store it would have cost 7-8 rubles [R] if my memory, which has forgotten the taste of chocolate, serves me right. The free market vendor was asking R20. Even so, my hand moved involuntarily for my purse. But at this point I was forestalled by a quicker and more decisive lady. Someone spitefully asked her whether it was a pity to pay so much or whether she was rolling in money; she answered with a smile, "Where have you seen candy for sale in the stores?"

Alas, candy, cigarettes, wine—where are you? It seems that only recently we had an assortment of these signs of civilization. But two months ago the service of the Department for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation arrested two young people from the Estonian city of Payde in Novgorod. The boys were busily selling cigarettes, chewing gum, and chocolate, which even back then, it seems, were not finding their way out to the far reaches of Estonia. Despite the high prices, far higher than the state's prices, the buyers kept coming, the amount of the "take" grew rapidly, and when they were arrested the boys pretended, although perhaps they were sincere, to be surprised: "In our republic this is called commerce; why is it called profiteering in yours?"

Even so, there was cunning in their words. In our country infected by speculation—the inevitable symptom of universal shortages—any republic today is economically unhealthy. New facts speak about the scale of the epidemic. Two Baltic republics have already adopted their own laws forbidding any kind of resale at increased prices of goods produced at state enterprises—no matter whether it is trade on commission, in the cooperatives, or on the street corner. Huge fines are stipulated for violators. At the very same time, the authorities of the Kuzbass adopted a ruling that is the exact contrary—there cigarettes may be sold by anyone to anyone and at any price.

I will not try to figure which of the rulings is more correct in our state of hopelessness. To tell the truth, I personally was always sickened when purchasing anything from deliberate swindlers. Somehow it is repulsive and shameful to be cheated. But lately I have been noting and examining the speculator with lively interest—one has to live, and that means dressing oneself no worse than the others and making sure that one's son does not go off to school barefoot. At this point I pull myself up short: After all, this is not an honest worker doing the selling but a regular cheat whose whole effort boils down to two primitive transactions—buying cheap and selling dear.

Certainly the reader who does not tend toward introspection and emotions will give me a lesson in political economy to the effect that the process of purchasing and selling is the most genuine sort of market. The very thing we are trying to attain as quickly as possible. On the open market there must inevitably be a desire for profit, and there cannot be any place for sentimental considerations about what is good and what is bad.

I understand, and I will grant that point. Nonetheless, I do not wish to call, for example, citizens S. or L., whose case is currently under investigation in the Novgorod city militia department, merchants. S. was arrested at the request of some residents of Tver. They arrived in Novgorod, where VM-12 video tape recorders are manufactured, in the hope of buying this hard-to-obtain equipment. Near the "Elektronika" outlet store someone promised to assist them. The Tver residents were pleased with this. But they were not pleased with something else: Instead of the state price of R1,200, the voluntary assistant had set his own at more than two times higher. Once the price was paid, the equipment was easily obtained. The profiteer and the clerk of the outlet store who was helping him were caught red-handed. In the course of the investigation, episodes surfaced one after the another clearly testifying to the fact that for S., the resident of Novgorod, the resale of "videos" had been a profitable trade for a long time. Over the last three or four years alone, dozens had passed through his hands. At the very least, four were purchased in that same "Elektronika." And this despite the fact that, as any fan of such equipment will tell you, registration for the purchase of hard-to-obtain goods takes place once per year, only one VM-12 is sold to a customer every five years, and on registration day thousands of people wanting to become video owners practically fight to the death.

Incidentally, the investigator, V. Persidskiy, is almost convinced that with regard for the current economic conditions the court will not give either S. or especially L. a large sentence, even though Article 154 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Criminal Code, when it is "applied to its full extent," is a very harsh article.

"Eight years ago S. was convicted for speculation, but even then he only received two years of corrective labor," said Vladimir Konstantinovich. "Now its seems that the matter is reaching the point where the article stipulating punishment for speculation will be repealed."

Just what we need! The people are boiling: Nothing can be purchased without paying additional costs, the mafia is everywhere, thieves are operating without restraint, and the new edicts on speculation are not edicts for them. And then—to abolish the punishment?

"But today trade and purchasing cooperatives exist completely legally," says G. Gavrilov, acting chief of the oblast Department for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, answering a question with a question: "Are these not the very same profiteers, merely united in a collective and organized? But now they pay something in the form of a tax to the state, although that just makes it worse for the customer. I would suggest that peddlers also be registered so that they may trade, and let them pay a tax. After all, it is clear that speculation is a social phenomenon and no administrative or criminal measures will uproot it. There can only be one remedy—fill up the store shelves. Although I often recall Lenin's warning that speculation and bribery are our number one enemy, able to destroy the revolution. Could they also not derail our perestroyka?..."

These words put me on my guard: Does this mean that the leaders of the Novgorod service for combating the embezzlement of socialist property and speculation do not see any reason to concern themselves with rooting out speculation on the territory entrusted to them? No, as it turns out. They are fighting it, and quite successfully, at least while the current laws are in effect.

But the figures show that the profiteering economy is growing by leaps and bounds. Last year, for example, 108 cases of criminal speculation that were uncovered by the militia and punished returned over R39,000 to the state. At present there have been 85 such cases since the beginning of the year, but the returns were greater—R71,000. Quite understandably, one is especially struck by the rate of increase in speculation in alcohol—from four incidents in 1984 to 103 in 1988, which until now was the record. This year threatens to surpass it. Even the investigators and agents who handle the cases cannot recall what kind of "catch" the militia netted in June.

What is more, our neighbors from Tver are again involved in the matter, but as criminals rather than victims this time. At one of the factories of his oblast D. Kulikov, the driver of a refrigerator truck, received a whole load of port wine to be conveyed to the trade organizations of Vyshniy Volochek. But he did not want to drive that delicacy to the store: He assembled his friends as well as the drivers of Tver's long-distance transport and they began combing the Novgorod area. They sold 1,000 bottles of port directly from the vehicle. Their appetites increased from one place to the next. The mobile merchants sold the first bottles, worth R3.4, for only R5; when they were arrested in Borovichi, they were already up to R6. Tens of thousands of rubles passed through the hands of the travelling peddlers. They were preparing to bring money—the state price of what had been sold—to the trade establishment in Vyshniy Volochek. Were they perhaps counting on understanding and assistance?

And there is more! Sometimes it seems that our country is a most reliable training ground for sharpening the skills of swindlers and crooks. Everything around me—that is to say the common property—is not mine. It belongs to whomever, but not to me. Last autumn a certain Bondarenko, energetic and charming, counting fully on fantastic disorder, appeared at the very place that should have had the least of it, the restricted-access Novgorod factory imeni the 24th Party Congress. Apparently his charm permitted him to garner such trust that, in full view of all and without any papers, he was entrusted by the workers of the sales department, supposedly on an order from Minsk, with 160 video tape recorders worth almost R200,000! The cunning man drove his riches to Kiev and traded them for a profit without embarrassment and with enterprise. The Minsk clients became alarmed. They explained to the gullible Novgorod salesmen that they had not sent any drivers for the output that was due them. Then the operations services of the Novgorod Department of Internal Affairs had to pick up the case. To their credit, they not only tracked down the youth, who had practically become a modern nouveau riche, but they even managed to obtain full compensation for the losses. But perhaps they should have exacted the losses from those idiots who will not under any condition let either militiamen or journalists into their restricted-access enterprise without a pass but threw their gates open for a crook.

And I am not at all pleased with cases that were made public just a few days ago in Novgorod. At the instruction of the director of the department store "Rus," goods in high demand worth R18,000 were kept from sale. Clothing, footwear, and other stock worth R15,000 were hidden from customers at a sporting goods store. One asks whether it was only for acquaintances? Or?... And if not, then where are the flourishing profiteers getting their goods from? So it is quite understandable why criminal cases were instituted at the oblast directorate of internal affairs in these instances. Who knows where the trail will lead.

I was floored by a recent visit to the "Podarka" store in the center of Novgorod. There they sell the work of artists and the products of cooperatives. My eye was caught by a small music box and its price tag—R250. Just a few minutes before I had seen the very same box, and not just one, in the office of the directorate of internal affairs situated directly opposite that very store. Those boxes had been confiscated that morning from local black marketeers pestering foreigners along with a mass of other beautiful trifles and things sold to foreigners at one-third the price. There, these music boxes were in the factory wrapping marked with the inscription "Moscow souvenir," and the price was marked. How much do you think they cost? R80 per item....

Conceivably any transaction may be called a commercial one, if you wish. But look around. I guarantee that you will be surprised: Such commerce will not be acceptable to the consciences of the majority of our fellow citizens, who are barely making ends meet. Such merchants evoke just as much fury and irritation from the people, who are already about to hit the flash point, as the inability of the state to eliminate shortages. It is probably no accident that, having announced the transition to a market that is unfamiliar to us, the Russian Government gave much thought to when such a transition should be begun. Because it is impossible to go anywhere without having first worked out measures able to prevent our dying economy from turning into a speculator's economy instead of a market one, two very different things.

Reports Note Reactions to Russian Bank Reforms

Overcentralization Criticized

9140018A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Ya. Dubenetskiy, chairman of the board, USSR Industrial Construction Bank: "A Breakthrough... Toward a Monopoly"]

[Text] Recently, the newly created Russian State Bank has taken measures aimed at creating a rigidly centralized banking system in Russia with the blessing of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet. Dozens of bank offices in the field have been eliminated on instructions from the center. In our opinion, such utter destruction of the profound foundation of the banking system, which was developed over many years, is fraught with consequences for our economy, the gravity of which is hard to predict.

In 1987, the creation of a decentralized chain of banks began in our country that eliminated the undisputed monopoly of the USSR State Bank, while the latter retained its functions as the main issue center of our country. Specialized independent banking structures—the Industrial Construction Bank [Promstroybank], the Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development [Zhilsotsbank], and the Agroindustrial Bank, were created, along with a chain of commercial banks based on them. Such an organizational pattern is considered optimal throughout the world. The State Bank should not engage in serving clients. It is a center for economic policy-making. Specialized establishments handle credit. Thus, in the United States 20 bank "chains" are in operation. Finance in Great Britain is controlled by "the big four." In France, banking transactions occur mainly through the offices of the five largest banks, and in the FRG through those of the two largest banks. Suffice it to say that about one-half of the funds of the Union budget, or R1.8 trillion, pass through our bank alone. Yet, we suddenly became unnecessary.

At first sight, all of this may look like fighting the monopolistic attitude of the center. However, the actions of Russian financiers are an attempt to restore monopolistic attitudes of the worst kind. A single administration of the RSFSR State Bank reporting strictly to the same master is being created where strong independent branches of three or four banks used to be. Where weak branches that lived off the subsidies from the central office of the bank used to be, "independent commercial banks" suddenly spring up, their operations doomed ahead of time to failure and bankruptcy because their own turnover is incapable of covering even their current expenses for maintaining their personnel. Their closure would amount to leaving a number of enterprises outside the sphere of financial services because there are simply no other banking establishments in these locations. In general, all of us know full- well what the monopoly of a particular establishment means.

According to the most conservative calculations, losses of the budget, which is being crushed by the deficit to begin with, will amount to at least R50 billion as a result of eliminating the USSR Promstroybank alone. These are funds obtained by enterprises as long-term loans and organizational expenses. The danger of a major social shock is likewise great. Up to R100 billion in wages are annually paid through the Promstroybank to workers and clerical personnel of industrial enterprises. A shortage of funds will unavoidably bring about delays in the payments of money.

The state debt and the deficits of the Union republic budgets will unavoidably increase, and the financial condition of the entire economy will deteriorate. A shortage of funds is the main problem for all the banks of our country. The central offices of the bank have such funds, whereas all that the low-level divisions have is a portfolio of unpaid promissory notes. Were they to spin off as independent "mini-banks," the sign "bankrupt" would appear on their doors the very next day. For the same reason, all current industrial construction would come to a halt and the already invested funds would be tied up because the branches previously received funds for these purposes from the central offices; having become small commercial banks they will lose such an opportunity.

Receiving a loan of any consequence will become virtually impossible because only a large bank is in a position to provide it. In essence, this means that even a semblance of market relations is going to be paralyzed.

Finally, the disintegration of the existing bank system means mass layoffs of our employees in the field, and there are tens of thousands of them. The new masters are not only squandering qualified specialists, but are also violating a constitutional right to work.

At present, we frequently get to hear of the intention of a number of republic state banks, including the Russian bank, to begin printing their own currencies under certain conditions. Such a step would spell the end of the Union. Money functions in a certain economic environment. The appearance of one's own currency would entail the delineation of the republics, the appearance of customs borders between the republics, contradictions, and so on, and so forth. For example, at present preparations are under way in the EC for creating a "United Europe." The elimination of national currencies and the introduction of a uniform monetary unit, the ECU, is one of its key elements. In our country, everything happens in reverse, endless talk about a new Union Treaty notwithstanding.

Incidentally, our partners abroad respond to such banking cataclysms in a very clear-cut manner. The euphoria of love for perestroyka is ebbing abruptly. This is hardly surprising: In the international finance community, our country has acquired the poor reputation of an unpunctual debtor. This is why banking combinations in Russia merely exacerbate the situation.

The situation of our bank in the sphere of international settlements is somewhat better. For now, Western banks and financial institutions are still interested in expanding business contacts, viewing the USSR Promstroybank as a reputable credit and settlement center, the largest in the country, which has the bulk of enterprises that manufacture industrial products among its customers. By now, 28 agreements on cooperation with foreign banks and companies have been signed, including leading banks from France, England, Finland, the FRG, Austria, India, and Sweden.

As a result of interbank agreements, an arrangement was made for the Dresdner Bank (FRG) and the Banca Commerciale Italiano (Italy) to open credit lines in hard currency to the USSR Promstroybank. This will make it possible to allocate significant hard currency resources to augment the export-oriented facilities of industrial enterprises and organizations located on the territories of all union republics.

A number of joint enterprises and financial institutions aimed at expanding banking services in the sphere of foreign economic operations have been created with the capital participation of our bank.

Foreign economic operations of our bank have been acknowledged by the world banking community and have earned an international prize for successes in promoting business cooperation, awarded by the organization "Trade Leaders Club" to which bankers and businessmen from 120 countries belong.

Alas, all of these "reports" may soon become nothing but history: Not a single partner of ours will want to invest money in the manifestly losing proposition towards which the RSFSR State Bank is pushing us.

In our opinion, the need has become imminent to transform the USSR Industrial Construction Bank into a universal credit and finance establishment of a type new in principle: a banking concern operating on a joint-stock and commercial basis. Creating this bank as a joint-stock company, the shares of which may be freely purchased by Soviet and foreign enterprises, organizations, and citizens appears to be the most expedient. Participation in implementing structural and social policy and aid to carrying out the most significant republic, interrepublic, and interindustry programs, augmenting the export potential, and forming a money market and a securities market could become the main tasks of this bank.

May Cause 'Complete Chaos'

PM1910115190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent V. Kirillov: "Banks Prior to Reform"]

[Text] During the USSR Supreme Soviet's discussion of the reform of the banking system the main attention was devoted to the organization and principles for the functioning of the country's central bank—the USSR State Bank [Gosbank]—and its relations with commercial banks. The problem of restructuring existing specialized state banks, above all the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction, which services the bulk of state sector enterprises, was virtually untouched. People at the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction believe that this situation could have highly serious consequences and needs the speediest legislative resolution.

The fact that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Gosbank, on the basis of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's decisions on sovereignty, is making inroads into the USSR Industrial Construction Bank, Agro-Industrial Bank, and Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development Bank systems with the intention of using them to set up a host of commercial banks will result in the elimination of the existing system of payments, credit management, and execution of the state budget, that is, complete chaos in the country's economy. State backing for purposeful work to renew production potential, introduce progressive technologies, and broaden the range and boost the quality of output will be impossible. The hasty commercialization of the banking system will not only entail the elimination of poorly-managed formations but will also reduce to the verge of bankruptcy those enterprises that produce output which the national economy needs and which are experiencing difficulties owing to unsatisfactory work by related enterprises, are restructuring production, or suffering because of unbalanced prices.

People at the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction think that state commercial banking formations should be a stabilizing principle during the period of transition to the market. These structures are more stable in any economic situation and can concentrate major financial resources on resolving the priority tasks of economic development. Without a state credit system it will be impossible to ensure credit backing for the government's intersectoral and interregional economic programs, along with the stable operation of fundamental all-Union sectors, including the defense complex.

Different views can be taken of the assessments of the RSFSR Gosbank made by senior officials at the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction during a conversation with a TASS correspondent regarding the work of the liquidation [likvidatsionnyye] commissions currently engaged in transferring previous structures to RSFSR Gosbank operational control. The rush for megaprofits alone will probably not be the sole motivating factor in the activity of the commercial banks. But one thing is indisputable—the banking system's transfer to commercial principles should be effected with consideration for the special features of USSR, republic, and regional economic development, the strengthening of commodity-money relations, and the activation of all the elements within the self-regulatory system, while perfecting the methods and accumulating experience of working with commercial banks.

Paper Seeks To Dispel Fears

PM1910131090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by I. Zhagel: "Don't Rush To Hide Your Hard Currency Under the Bed"]

[Text] There has been yet another powerful outburst of emotion on the "hard currency front"—branches of the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity are again being stormed.

There is, as a matter of fact, nothing surprising in the big changes that are now taking place in the sphere of currency regulation. For seven decades we made a pretty good hash of things here. It is a pity, however, that the attitude of people to every step taken by the government—mistrust and fear that they want to deceive them and deprive them of their honestly earned dollars, francs, and marks—remains unchanged.

A recent report on the possible introduction of a commercial rate for the ruble [R] caused a stir. Many owners of hard currency rushed to withdraw it from their accounts, already feeling themselves all but robbed, particularly as those feelings had been fueled by certain publications.

It became clear, in particular, that the new rate—slightly under R2 to the dollar—will reduce your capital in the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity several times. And this would ostensibly happen: if there were, say, 600 foreign currency rubles in your account, with the former rate you could receive around $1,000 for them, while with the new one, it would be roughly $300. How could one not get agitated?

True, before giving their readers a heart attack the journalists who jumped to conclusions could have made enquiries at the USSR State Bank. And there they would have been told that the measures planned by the government will not result in the depreciation of citizens' deposits in the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, because the funds held there will be increased in proportion to the reduction in the rate of the ruble. That is to say, by roughly three times. In any event, the equivalent in foreign currency for each individual deposit will not change.

However, it would scarcely be fair to just blame journalists for another emotional outburst.

I think that any change in the sphere of currency regulation should be simultanously accompanied by very detailed commentaries. Particularly today. And the USSR State Bank report on protective measures for investments, for example, came to IZVESTIYA through TASS channels only after the furor was created. And that report only explains things in relation to individual investments. But what about enterprises' foreign currency accounts?

Their representatives are already starting to sound the alarm, including ringing our newspaper. Let us waste no time therefore in reporting the information that we obtained by telephone from the USSR State Bank: Namely, that enterprises' deposits in foreign currency rubles will be increased by the appropriate ratio.

However, there is a fine distinction here: The point is that there exist so-called clearing [balansovyy] and nonclearing [nebalansovyy) accounts. The difference between them is that the bank has paid enterprises a certain sum in ordinary, "inferior" rubles for funds held in nonclearing accounts. And if they want to get their foreign currency back, they have to return the ruble payment.

Thus, after the introduction of the commercial rate, three times as many "inferior" rubles will have to be paid. Therefore, in order that an enterprise should not come out the loser it is still allowed to redeem the foreign currency prior to the reform. Moreover, a certain period may be fixed during which funds may be transferred fromm nonclearing to clearing accounts.

Thus, all the anxious questions would appear to have been answered. But this will only happen if the leaders of all the enterprises read this information. And if they do not? It will mean that mistrust in the government persists and the front again remains unchanged. How adept we are at producing confrontation in even the simplest things.

Kirgizian Regional Economic Agreements End

91US0026A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Gennagiy Shipitko: "On the Basis of Mutual Profits"]

[Text] **The first results came in of Kirgizia's campaign of mutual cooperation agreements with other regions of the country. Some of the future, 1991, partners of the republic are the Baltic republics, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldova, Armenia, and Russia.**

They have already signed 70 percent of the contracts with various industries that previously had had economic ties with them. This figure is considerably higher than anywhere else in the country.

Such vigorous partnership activity has been caused mainly by its mutually profitable character. And experts also cite another reason—established economy of the republic that produces most important types of raw materials. This fact recently served to accuse the center of developing the republic lop-sidedly, but now it unexpectedly helped to bring profits to the area. Among other things, they will supply the Baltic republics with larger than before quantities of wool and other products from industrial enterprises of union subordination. I am emphasizing this fact because appeals are still heard to close the enterprises that, according to some local politicians, do not reflect the ethnic peculiarities of Kirgizia.

The biggest obstacles are encountered by Kirgizia when they are trying to agree on the next year contracts and product supplies with the neighboring republics. Now, even before they finished harvesting the fields, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan have almost stopped supplying fuel. Telegrams addressed to the presidents of the two republics remain unanswered.

Regional Gas Supply Redistribution Planned

LD1710211990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] Many regions in the USSR find themselves in a difficult situation this year as regards power supplies in the run-up to winter. It is surprising to hear that this applies to areas that have traditionally been considered energy-supplying. The situation is, however, improving.

Siberians have long called for a reorgnaization of the gas distribution network. Gas has long flowed across the Urals in pipelines. It can hardly be regarded as normal that most Siberian towns, including ones as large as Barnaul and Krasnoyarsk, have no mains supply of gas. The branch pipeline to Novosibirsk from the Parabel-Kuzbass trunk pipeline, built several years ago, did little to improve the situation in Novosibirsk, with its population of 1,500,000. Now, however, a pipeline has been laid from Tomsk to Novosibirsk, bringing Tyumen gas to the city. The new pipeline has enabled several Siberian oblasts to plug in simultaneously into the country gas supply network. Unfortunately, this good news only applies to town-dwellers: "the gasification of villages is way behind schedule".

Port City Plans for Free Enterprise Zone

PM1610103490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Report by L. Savitskiy; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter] The willingness of the inhabitants of Nakhodka to carry out an experiment on their territory was not born in a vacuum, so to speak. For many years Nakhodka was the only port in the Soviet Far East where foreign ships were allowed to call. Consulates and missions of a number of Asian and Pacific Ocean countries operate here. However, in their efforts to establish a free enterprise zone, the inhabitants of Nakhodka are banking above all on the unique geographical location of their city and its existing industrial potential.

The city extends over almost 100 km along the shores of the two bays. The freight turnover of the port of Nakhodka exceeds 25 million tonnes per year. Our country's entire transcontinental sea and railroad transit traffic passes through Nakhodka. An entrepreneurial council has been established here for the implementation of measures connected with the city's new status, and it has been working together with foreign businessmen for more than a year.

[V.S. Gnezdilov, Nakhodka City Soviet Executive Committee chairman] Many contracts have already been signed. What we need now is a government document providing guarantees for them [foreign businessmen]. Guarantees are what they want most. This is what is holding us up to some extent at present. Although I must say that eight joint ventures are already operating here, they do not just exist on paper but in practice.

[Reporter] The inhabitants of Nakhodka have great plans in connection with the establishment of a free enterprise zone. They include expanded transport services, increased international transit freight traffic and ship repair facilities. These will produce massive dividends for the city, the republic, and the country as a whole. And the most important point is that in order to earn this money it will not be necessary to fell timber, extract oil, or mine coal.

Lack of Funds Halts Rebuilding of Power Station

PM1610091690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by G. Chudnyy, G. Shkabardin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter] The Tomsk GRES [state regional electric power station] No. 2 is the city's main heat supplier. The station was built in the forties and fifties. The equipment has served twice its normal service life and must be either replaced now, or the station must be shut down for total reconstruction. There is another option. To build a 12th boiler room as a matter of urgency. This would make it possible to carry out the reconstruction without shutting down the station. However, the construction has been halted because of lack of funds.

Another 24 stations currently under construction in Siberia are in a similar parlous state.

Aircraft Engines Dumped in Smolensk

PM1910113990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2055 GMT 17 Oct 90

[Report by V. Vengrzhnovskiy, from Smolensk; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter] This is not a scrap heap, but Smolensk inhabitants know about this place. Behind a tumbledown fence powerful supersonic combat aircraft engines have been stored—if you can call it that—for more than 10 years. These are very expensive items. Many paths lead here. Enterprising guys have found uses for the flexible pipes and the nuts and bolts from this military equipment. What cannot be dismantled is simply wrenched off. We were unable to interview the comrades responsible. They are not usually here. However, as IZVESTIYA wrote recently, it is easier to bury these millions in the ground than take them to a scrap yard to recycle the valuable nonferrous metal, or let agricultural workers have them to dry hay, or dismantle them and sell the nuts and bolts in stores to be used by skillful hands.

This is conversion Smolensk-style, conversion with a history.

Vladimir Vengrzhnovskiy and cameraman Igor Grinenko, specially for the "Television News Service."

Freightcar Blockade Delays Fertilizer Exports

PM1910141790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Oct 90

[Report by A. Salnikov and K. Bratchuk; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Is it possible to bring a successful enterprise which has been steadily fulfilling the deliveries plan for the past nine years to the brink of closure in a matter of just over a month? Asking this—in the conditions of our sick economy—rhetorical question, our correspondent reports on the critical situation at the Altay Coking and Chemical Plant.

[Reporter] The problem arose because of ammonium sulphate. The Altay Coking and Chemical Plant is to deliver 30,000 tonnes of it to China in exchange for various consumer goods. The Chinese are not just paying well for this mineral fertilizer, they also manufacture and provide the paper bags for it.

However, since 7 September the Altay Railroad has been refusing to ship out this output, which was to have been dispatched to the consumer straight from the production line. What you see is unnecessary labor—loading and dispatch of the sulphate to warehouses. It has to be removed from the production premises regardless of cost. Otherwise the plant will be forced to halt the production of coke—its main output—for technological reasons. The warehouses are chock-a-block. And 30 railroad freightcars loaded with fertilizer have been waiting on sidings at the plant for dispatch for more than a month.

The railroad workers are saying that the plant's workers have loaded them without authorization and that the cars were intended for bread transportation.

At the same time, we shot this film at the plant. The pictures are unusual, even by old "management" standards. Three covered freightcars, absolutely ideal for the transportation of bread, have arrived loaded with timber, as you can see. This seems to be ideal material for critical comment.

So what is going on?

[V.V. Mityayev, plant director] I can only describe it as an industrial racket. Everyone is rushing to earn hard currency. The railroad is no exception. They have said to us: "Pay in hard currency and we will ship out your output." I believe that this must be stopped. But it can only be stopped by increasing liability, including criminal liability. It is not just that our people will not receive the promised consumer goods: We will be branded as unreliable partners, and the Chinese side is bound to draw its conclusions from this.

[Reporter] The plant has already reduced its production of coke—the essential fuel for the country's metallurgical enterprises. Closing down these coking batteries altogether would inflict heavy damage on our economy.

[Announcer] Quite. While this report was in the pipeline, the 30 car-loads of fertilizer were finally dispatched to their destination after the long wait. But this was an isolated step, and, what is more, one taken under pressure. The problem remains. The problem of the guaranteed dispatch of export goods.

Scientific

Cosmonaut's Ill Health Delays Spacewalk

PM2210151790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Report by P. Orlov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] There has been an unexpected change in the plans of the seventh main expedition—Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov—to the "Mir" station. You can learn the details from a reportage by our correspondent Petr Orlov.

[Reporter] On Friday, 19 October, the crew was to leave the station to repair the hatch and to prepare the station for the new solar batteries. However, during a medical checkup session doctors raised the alarm. According to objective tests the board engineer's capacity for work is greatly impaired. This is the scientific formulation. In plain language, Gennadiy Strekalov has a cold. Where did one of our most experienced cosmonauts catch a cold? It appears that it happened on the velo-ergometer [trainer bike]. As you can see, Commander Gennadiy Manakov just assembling it. Gennadiy Strekalov simply caught a cold by being in a draft. And that is no joke. The highly fit cosmonauts can be incapacitated practically by only two things—psychological incompatibility with the earth or within the crew, and drafts. The air does not circulate of its own accord on the "Mir" station, and there are no ventilation windows, of course. The air is moved by fans. This is how Gennadiy Mikhaylovich Strekalov caught his cold. The rest is no different from what happens on earth—doctors have forbidden him to go out. The cold treatment is also orthodox—aspirin and ascorbic acid. So the flight engineer will have to sweat it out. Not in the spacesuit, but inside the station. Incidentally, the same amount of time for cold treatment treatment is allowed in space as on earth—seven days. No sick notes are issued, however. So the cosmonauts continue to work. Today they adjusted the remote camera located outside the station and can photograph the earth with greater precision than ever before. This is needed for geophysical research and agriculture.

As for the cold—the Americans, for instance, had to put off a shuttle launch because of the commander's cold. And we have had to put off our spacewalk until 30 October.

Nuclear Stations Resist Outside Supervision

PM2210134990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 90 Union Edition p 6

[Article by Andrey Illesh under the rubric: "Rumors and Facts": "More about Nuclear Reactors in Moscow"]

[Text] In an article devoted to events at nuclear power stations I asked the "seditious" question: Nuclear reactors are calmly operating right under Muscovites' noses—what kind are they, and why are they operating? On that occasion I spoke mostly about experimental reactors. I wanted to get precise information: How many reactors are there in the capital; to what extent their location within a city with many millions of inhabitants is justified; what goes on inside them; and, of course, how safe these reactors are.

At the time, such questions were considered "not for the press." Times, fortunately, are changing, and today I can acquaint readers with the results of an inspection of experimental nuclear reactors; the material was kindly given to us by Candidate of Technological Sciences K. Konoplev, chairman of a commission of experts, and Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences R. Nikolskiy, chairman of a subcommission on safety.

So then, the commission investigated nine experimental reactors located within the city boundaries and presented its results to the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, and the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry. A joint conference of these three departments, the academics report, agreed with their findings.

So as not to appear biased, I will cite from the document given to the editors:

"On the whole the Moscow City reactors that were investigated are being operated safely, and the radiation levels for the population of the adjacent rayons have not exceeded, and do not exceed, background levels. Investigation of the accidents and incidents that have taken place does not change the conclusion on safety. The reactors are operated at a high professional level. At the same time, specific deviations from the operating norms and rules were found virtually at every experimental reactor. These deviations are far from being of equal importance; some have already been eliminated, but the elimination of the others requires the shutdown of four reactors.... During our commission's period of work a commission from the International Atomic Energy Agency was working at two of the reactors—IR-8 and IRT—carrying out an assessment of their safety at the USSR government's request. This commission consisted of experts from Austria, Canada, Poland, and the United States.... The commission found that the personnel running both reactors were qualified and well trained. The internal order corresponds to the best standards of nuclear safety. The International Atomic Energy Agency experts assessed other aspects of work higher than our commission."

Further on, the experts ask a question which especially worries people: Even if experimental nuclear reactors are operated safely, how can the possibility and consequences of a catastrophic accident be assessed? After all, nowadays it is the custom to measure all nuclear emergency situations against the yardstick of the Chernobyl disaster.... I will again resort to a quotation: "The potential radiation danger of experimental nuclear reactors are hundreds and thousands of times smaller than nuclear power stations.... The physical peculiarities of the reactors investigated are such that they possess properties whereby a nuclear chain reaction is automatically suppressed [svoistva samogasheniya yadernogo protsessa]. But despite the extreme improbability, the consequences of potential disasters caused by outside influences must also be considered. The experts devoted particular attention to the need to increase the reactors' defense against probable outside influences: hurricanes, serious earthquakes, and aircraft crashes."

And is it possible anyway to remove these reactors from Moscow—naturally without any marked detriment to science? This was a difficult question for the commission: After all, extremely topical research is being conducting at these reactors. MR, the most powerful Moscow reactor (with a 40-megawatt capacity), is used for the loop testing of materials [petlevyye ispitaniye materialov]. The commission believes that it is entirely possible to continue the work, which is important to reinforce the safety of nuclear power stations, both those that are already operating and those which are under construction. But the reactor could be transferred from the territory of the Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy. In short, a new one could be built—quite a long way from Moscow.

IR-8, the second most powerful reactor (eight megawatts), is used as a source of neutron beams for physics experiments. In the commission's opinion, it is expedient to keep this reactor in the Kurchatov Institute for the purposes of fundamental research and the production of preparations. The remaining reactors have much smaller capacities, and their shutdown is not recommended. And the conclusion: "Naturally, all the demands and proposals of the subcommission on safety must be fulfilled."

And now for what this commission finds it difficult to do. "A large number of comments arose over the fact that the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation's reactors are monitored by its own departmental monitoring service." What about that then! We have a (supposedly) important monitoring organ—the State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry—but its experts do not have the power to interfere in the affairs of many nuclear installations. In these installations they manage things as before, "inspecting" themselves. But such activity is not only fraught with serious consequences (who wants to wash his dirty linen in public, and what reliance can be placed in the scruples of people inspecting themselves?); it also makes it simply impossible for us to assert that everything is OK in the capital from the nuclear safety viewpoint.

There is no justification for this secrecy which falls within the scope of reason. By continuing to play at being "enigmatic," departments risk undermining their authority once and for all. After all, life shows that, in our country, under the mask of secrecy people are usually hiding their own blunders or potential weaknesses. I was lucky enough to visit Germany's most important nuclear installations with a delegation of Soviet nuclear physicists. Over there they do not keep either the location of reactors or the level of danger from them secret from the people living in the vicinity. In the largest nuclear scientific center, located a stone's throw from Munich with its population of two million people, the layman can get all the data he needs for "confidence in tomorrow." The essence of the work carried out by physicists can be secret (a commercial secret, for instance); but the safety level and geography of the "installation" cannot be.

...You will recall that it was nine reactors that underwent the inspection. So there are only nine of them in Moscow? I, for one, will not undertake to answer this question affirmatively. What is more, I possess data which shows that there are many more reactors in the city (and not just experimental reactors). For instance, nowadays departments use the following trick: Not all installations (owing to small capacity, for example) fall into the category of "reactors." But their basic nuclear "nature" is no different because of this....

The commission, as far as I understand, ran into similar "complications": Its conclusion that the Moscow reactors must be placed under the control of an independent state organ—the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry—as the commissioners themselves confess, "met with huge opposition, both in the course of work and in the aforementioned conference. Nevertheless, this point has been accepted too."

Shall we wait for the decision to be fulfilled?

New Hovercraft Begins Service on Lake Baykal

PM2310100490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Report by N. Vidonov and N. Morozov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter] This high-speed motor vessel, the first of a new series, was built at the Sosnovskiy shipyard on the Vyatka river specifically on the orders of Siberian river transport workers. Now it is already conquering the expanses of the Angara river and Lake Baykal. However, before getting here, the new vessel had to cover a complex route extending over many thousands of kilometers on the Kama and Volga rivers, the Arctic Sea, and the Lena river. Only a whole year later did it finally end up in Irkutsk, its port of registration. Immediately, wasting no time, the ship's builders and its present masters—the river transport workers—have embarked on comprehensive sea trials. The Barguzin—which is what the flagship is called, after a Baykal storm wind—has many merits and technical innovations. It is the first air-cushion vessel on the Baykal. It needs no special piers or landing stages, and can put in on practically any shore at any place. And this is very convenient for passengers, in particular tourists, geologists, and oil and gas field workers.

The first trip is over. What does the captain say?

[V.K. Tolstykh, captain of the Barguzin] What do I say? The ship is spacious, beautiful, and comfortable, it has excellent maneuvrability. It is bound to conquer the Baykal and gain favor with Siberia's passengers and ours.

[Reporter] During next year's navigation the Barguzin will be used for regular cruises on the Baykal.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis 'Surprised' by Ryzhkov's Comment

LD2210194490 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1700 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Jozsef Barath in Budapest; date not given; Landsbergis speaks in Lithuanian with superimposed Hungarian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Barath] Mr. President, what do you expect from your visit in Hungary?

[Landsbergis] I wish to participate tomorrow in the great holiday of the Hungarians, in the anniversary of the 1956 revolution. The freedom fighters of the Hungarians, your sacrifices, and everything that you have achieved represent support for us too.

Tomorrow I am going to unveil a memorial erected of carved wooden grave markers, made by Lithuanian artists, which commemorates the fight of the two peoples against the common oppression. Before the celebrations I will meet Mr. Arpad Goencz, the president, and I shall also have the honor of holding talks with the Foreign Affairs Committee of your Parliament.

[Barath] How do you evaluate the present state of Hungarian-Lithuanian relations?

[Landsbergis] There are many common factors in the history of our peoples. The solidarity toward each other's struggles and fights ties us together. At the same time, I think the time has come to make our cultural, economic, and political relations tighter, and to make Lithuanian-Hungarian cooperation stronger.

[Barath] What is the situation with Lithuanian-Soviet negotiations at the moment?

[Landsbergis] The talks will only start in real terms in the future. So far we have only carried out a dialogue about the negotiations themselves. However, there is a good chance that, following the success of the talks on talks, in November a substantive coordination of stances should start.

[Barath] Are you satisfied with the reply of Prime Minister Ryzhkov, which he gave on Soviet television?

[Landsbergis] I saw the interview given by Prime Minister Ryzhkov at the weekend about Lithuanian-Soviet relations and in which he rejected the fact that we should form direct relations with the republics. I can say that his words really surprised me. I consider that politics which accuses the negotiating partner with unfounded charges is incorrect. It is an incorrect policy to put pressure on the other party before the negotiations.

[Barath] Do you consider anohter blockade vis-a-vis Lithuania concievable?

[Landsbergis] Mr. Ryzhkov's television speech unfortunately proves exactly that such a possibility still exists.

Prunskiene Claims Moscow Toughens Stand on Talks

LD2210193990 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 22 TASS—The results of a recent consultative meeting in Moscow to prepare talks between Lithuania and the USSR mean that "we are nearing the start of real negotiations" with Moscow, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene told a news conference here today.

She said that the meeting, held on Saturday, decided to draw up, within the next ten days, a protocol on the opening of the talks.

Prunskiene, however, doubted that the resultant document could satisfy both sides.

She explained that Lithuania wanted it to define the status of negotiators as representatives of equal states. Moscow, in contrast, wanted the protocol to be a mere "technicality," registering only the very fact that the talks have opened, Prunskiene said.

Lithuanian Justice Minister Pranas Kuris, who took part in the consultative meeting and addressed the same news conference today, claimed that "enormous pressure" was brought to bear on the Lithuanian delegation in Moscow "to compel Lithuania to negotiate as an integral part of the USSR."

Prunskiene said that attempts to solve the acute problem of induction of Lithuanian youths into the Soviet Army have been to no avail. She insisted that "the drafting of Lithuanian citizens into the Soviet Army can only be on a voluntary basis."

Prunskiene claimed that Soviet representatives involved in preparations for the talks have lately "toughened their posture and are less inclined to compromise."

If the trend continues, "it will only remain (for the Moscow talks) to register realities stemming from the international recognition of Lithuania," she warned.

Prunskiene expressed the wish for the "Lithuanian issue" to be resolved by way of international agreements, like was the case with German reunification.

Prunskiene Examines Gorbachev's 'Obligation'

PM2310135590 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 12 Oct 90 p 12

[Report by Kaa Eneberg: "'The Prize Represents an Obligation'"]

[Text] The Nobel Peace Prize means an obligation on President Mikhail Gorbachev to support the Baltic states in their independence process. Otherwise the choice of peace prize winner could perhaps be interpreted as too hasty.

That was Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene's evaluation when she gave a press conference yesterday at Rosenbad. Immediately after her visit to Stockholm she will fly to Moscow to take part in the relaunched Soviet-Lithuanian talks.

Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, who invited Prunskiene to Sweden, promised that the Swedish Government will do everything in its power to ensure that the Baltic states "are given every opportunity" to follow the CSCE conference in Paris in November. However he was unable to hold out the prospect of observer status, but he did give an assurance that all the Nordic states are working for the Baltic republics to be given such a status in the CSCE.

In their protracted independence process the Baltic states have urged a place in the CSCE in every contact they have had with other governments, including Sweden's. Sweden has taken action but has not pressed the matter since such a decision requires consensus on the part of all the participating nations. There has been little prospect of full agreement on the question, Ingvar Carlsson said.

The Baltic governments have more than once expressed their disappointment over the difficulties besetting admission to the CSCE negotiations.

This time, on the podium in the Bella Venezia conference hall at the side of Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, Prime Minister Prunskiene chose to say in her own smiling but determined way that naturally all three Baltic states would ideally like to be involved in the CSCE as full members. But given the fact that they are dependent on other countries' support for this, she said that she is nevertheless satisfied with the promises from the Swedish prime minister.

She added spontaneously: "In the final analysis we are dependent on the consent of the Soviet Union for our independence. We see the choice of Mikhail Gorbachev as the recipient of this year's Nobel Peace Prize as placing a clear obligation on him—if he wants to be consistent in the peace work on which he has embarked—to support the Baltic states.

"If he does not do so it could become clear that his choice for the peace prize could be seen as too hasty."

Of the new round of talks in Moscow Prime Minister Prunskiene said that a number of preparatory committees have been appointed to prepare the consultations. Issues which Lithuania wants solved are enforced conscription into the Soviet Army—which Lithuania demands should cease—and a liberalization of the visa laws for foreigners who want to visit Lithuania. She stated very firmly that these are issues which have to be resolved in the preparatory work for the Lithuanians to be able to view the negotiations with the central authorities as fruitful.

Special working groups have also been set up to prepare the divorce of the Lithuanian central bank from the Soviet central bank and to take over border checks.

The Lithuanian Government has already set up what the prime minister called "economic checkpoints" on the border with the rest of the Union. These will prevent the illegal export of goods important to Lithuania—chiefly meat and dairy products. She stressed that it is uninspected "private" exports that Lithuania wants to halt and not the ordinary trade in these goods with the Soviet Union.

The prime minister, who is an economics professor and who has herself worked closely on the economic reform program, declared that in the future Lithuania will continue to view the Soviet Union as its most important trading partner. That is why it is also in the Lithuanians' interest that the Soviet economy is reformed and the Soviet Union stabilized.

However, she indicated that the Lithuanian republic does not see itself as part of the major economic reform program. Her reaction to the idea that the republics should be given great economic freedom was simply that this does not affect Lithuania because the Lithuanians have their own reform program.

The main purpose of Prunskiene's visit is to discuss how to save the Baltic Sea from ecological disaster. Kazimiera said that Lithuania "as an independent state" is prepared to meet its obligations in full and implement the so-called Ronneby declaration. This was agreed by the Baltic littoral states in Ronneby in September—an important meeting from which the Baltic heads of government stayed away in protest at being expected to form part of the Soviet delegation.

Ingvar Carlsson also said that the government had listened with interest to Kazimiera Prunskiene's assessment of the talks with Moscow. He dismissed questions about possible future Swedish mediation by saying that the Baltic states would probably prefer to handle the talks themselves. The Lithuanian prime minister smiled her agreement.

Prunskiene Discussions With Matlock Detailed

91UN0089A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 21 Sep 90 p 1

[ELTA report: "K. Prunskiene's Meetings in Moscow"]

[Text] Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, met with U.S. Ambassador in Moscow Jack Matlock in the offices of the permanent representation of the government of the Lithuanian Republic in Moscow on 20 September.

During the course of their one-and-a-half-hour conversation they exchanged opinions on the situation in Europe, the Soviet Union, and other parts of the world in connection with the course of the process of ending the consequences of World War II. K. Prunskiene drew the U.S. ambassador's attention to the fact that Lithuania does not consider the reunification of Germany the culmination of this process. We are trying, she said, to have the issue of strengthening Lithuania's statehood discussed at international forums.

J. Matlock officially confirmed that the United States is not changing its position of principle with respect to the annexation of the Baltic countries, and he noted that this issue should be resolved. Here he said that the Baltic countries, and Lithuania in particular, should create a favorable situation for themselves through realistic actions.

It was the ambassador's opinion that for Lithuania, which is trying to strengthen its independence, today this should evidently not be linked only with the unlawful nature of the annexation in 1940. He asserted that it is essential to proceed on the basis of today's realities, and at the same time thus enhance Lithuania's prestige.

In this sense, J. Matlock noted, there is no need to remind the international community about the issue of Lithuania. Both the United States and other states are maintaining their earlier positions of nonrecognition of the annexation of the Baltic countries. In his opinion, the processes now taking place in the Soviet Union in general and in Russia in particular are favorable for resolving problems related to the statehood of the Baltic countries.

The United States cannot apply direct pressure to the Soviet Union, J. Matlock said. This is unacceptable in the sense that the United States is interested in stability in the Soviet Union.

J. Matlock gave it to be understood that without the agreement of the USSR it is difficult to hope that the issue of the Baltic countries can be included in the program for the Helsinki-2 meeting. And so talks between Lithuania and the United States are the only way to resolve the problem. No matter what, J. Matlock said in conclusion, I look at all of this optimistically.

Vice Premier Romualdas Ozolas and the permanent representative of the government of the Lithuanian Republic in Moscow, Egidijus Bickauskas, were present at the meeting.

Prunskiene Briefs U.S. Reporters 20 Sep

91UN0089B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 21 Sep 90 p 1

[ELTA report:"K. Prunskiene's Meetings in Moscow"]

[Text] On 20 September Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, met with journalists from the United States at a news conference at the Savoy Hotel in Moscow.

K. Prunskiene talked about the development of events in Lithuania since the proclamation of the 11 March Act and presented a briefing on the situation that has taken shape in the political, economic, and social life of the republic.

K. Prunskiene noted that through the 11 March Act the democratically elected parliament of Lithuania expressed the will of the people to reinstate the historical truth, and it declared that the USSR's 1940 occupation trampled on Lithuania's independence.

Thereafter the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council passed laws aimed at asserting Lithuania's independence.

The USSR, however, is stubbornly reluctant to recognize our legitimate actions. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies rescinded [otozval] our decisions, and then an economic blockade was initiated. In the search for a compromise with the USSR we declared a moratorium. In K. Prunskiene's opinion the most realistic thing to do is move from a declaration of independence to its real affirmation—in negotiations. However, although both the sides have formed delegations for negotiations, they have not yet met. Moreover, we have prepared initial drafts of protocols for the talks but have received no response to them from the USSR side.

It seems to us, the prime minister noted, that the USSR Government is not interested in negotiations at this time. There are international reasons for this, including the conflict that has broken out in the Persian Gulf and German reunification. Perhaps the situation is also being complicated by the domestic economic situation in the USSR. It was the opinion of K. Prunskiene that the Gorbachev-Ryzhkov-Yeltsin triangle is not promising. It is quite possible that the present Ryzhkov cabinet will fall. This will also necessarily have an effect on the negotiations between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR. In short, the situation with respect to negotiations remains unclear.

On the other hand, K. Prunskiene said, it is clear that resolution of the Lithuanian question will again become a subject of international discussion even though they are telling us that we must wait for the reunification of Germany. We are convinced, however, that it is impossible to wipe out the consequences of World War II without resolving the problem of restoring the independence of the Baltic states. This must be included in the program for the Helsinki meeting.

Ozolas Discusses Negotiations With Moscow

LD2210193890 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 22 TASS—"If our relations with the outside world develop at the present pace, we have only to formalise realities, already recognised by the world, at talks with the Kremlin," Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Romualdos Ozolas said here on Sunday evening, reviewing weekly events on television.

He commented on last week's visit by the Nordic Council to Vilnius and Kazimiera Prunskiene's visit to Sweden.

Since the middle of last week Ozolas was in Moscow where groups of experts and specialists are working on documents for the forthcoming talks between Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

He noted that "the three days in Moscow were very difficult." "The Kremlin ignores both our and world logic," he said.

On the one hand, Ozolas noted, the Soviet side rejected all proposals to settle specific problems (the deployment of the Soviet Army in Lithuania, the question of visas, customs control, etc.) in the belief that their examination is possible only after political decisions are made.

On the other hand, the Lithuanian group that is drafting a protocol on the start of the talks, is encountering Moscow representatives' opposition to the inclusion of "political references" in this document, Ozolas continued.

He said that "there will be no more consultative meetings" and that "the Soviet-Lithuanian talks will begin."

The deputy premier called the drafting by a joint working group of a protocol on the start of the talks which could be signed at the next meeting by the two delegations, a condition for the start of bilateral talks.

"Moscow will be forced to recognise us: Only a few doubt this in the Kremlin, although the reverse is said out loud," Ozolas noted.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzkhov told reporters after a meeting with Lithuanian representatives on Saturday that the moratorium announced by the Lithuanian leadership on the declaration of independence that was proclaimed in March is the basis for the negotiations.

"It is unacceptable to us to define the final aim of the talks as their preliminary condition now," he said.

In Ryzhkov's opinion, the Lithuanian leadership understands well that "they are unable now to live without the Soviet economy and united economic space." "Talk about secession from the Soviet Union is conducted only from the political point of view," he added.

Kuzmickas Examines Negotiations With Moscow

LD2310134190 Vilnius Domestic Serivce in Lithuanian 0730 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Interview with Professor Bronius Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, by correspondent Balys Urbonas; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] As Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis has left for Hungary, today the deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, Prof. Bronius Kuzmickas, will be interviewed by journalist Balys Urbonas:

[Urbonas] Esteemed professor, you are at present carrying a heavy burden in preparations for negotiations with the Kremlin. We were all without a doubt agitated last week, at the end of our delegation's consultative meeting in Moscow, by the so-called news conference by the chairman of the Soviet Union's Council of Ministers, Nikolay Ryzhkov. I would dare to call that conference a propaganda farce, but as we are used to various cunning moves by the Kremlin we were not astonished this time either. I would like to ask you, though, to express your views on the last meeting concerning the negotiations. Does the Kremlin wish to proclaim to the world that negotiations are taking place, while in reality exerting pressure on the lost sheep—one Soviet Republic, in this case Lithuania—which according to Nikolay Ryzhkov has forgotten the Soviet Union's Constitution?

[Kuzmickas] It is very obvious that the Soviet delegation and the representatives of the Soviet delegation, who have been and are working the preparatory groups, wish to exert pressure on us—and we have experienced this in three days of talks in Moscow: that is on 18 October when the group for the coordination of the protocol for the beginning of the neogitations was working with the corresponding Soviet Union's group; on 19 October when the joint group was already working on a higher level; and then on 20 October when the delegations were meeting.

We felt this pressure, so to speak, on a rising wave. On Thursday it was smaller, reaching its summit on Saturday 20 October when the delegations were meeting with the participation of their leaders and all their members.

Now whether they will negotiate seriously or whether they only pretend—I am convinced that they do both. That the meetings are attended by many Soviet representatives—on 20 October the meeting was attended by the entire oficial delegation, and many experts for the whole day—bears witness to the fact that they regard us seriously. The tone itself shows that the negotiations are very improtant to the Soviet Union. But that they want to turn the negotiations in the direction useful to them—there is no doubt about that.

Now how is this pressure expressed? From the talks on the protocol at the beginning of negotiations until the concluding words, it has been obvious that the Soviet side does not wish to define in the protocol on the beginning of negotiations the present political status of Lithuania. This status, as you know, is based on tthe March 11 act of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. At the same time they do not wish to agree on a definition for the aim of the negotiations—that is on a definition that would include the terms of international law. Nor is there any wish to agree on a number of the conditions of the negotiations, conditions which if adhered to would ensure in Lithuania at least a minimum of social political stability: in other words, that there is no interference in Lithuania's internal affairs; that young people are not recruited and hunted by force into the Army; that there is no economic pressure; and others.

We did not succeed in agreeing to all this; the Soviet side was attempting to define the aim of the negotiations in very general terms and not in concrete form, that is with both sides sitting down to coordinate mutual problems such as relations among the enterprises and among organizations—in other words, something which could be accomplished without any negotiations. A proposal has been made to us more than once that the aim of the negotiations could not be known in advance: that it is possible that during the course of the negotiations Lithuania would become convinced that it would be very good and very useful to remain in the Soviet Union, and that every thing would remain as before. As far as I know, Ryzhkov stressed this at his news conference too—that he had an impression that Lithuania was not against it.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that the Soviet Union's delegation does not wish during the consultations and at the beginning of the negotiations to define Lithuania's political status. It leaves this for the future, and at the same time proposes that the teams of experts meet on economy, culture, citizens' rights, and other problems, and solve everything that concerns at present Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

But when on 18 or 19 October the representatives of some groups—those on the country's defense, on international relations, and on the economy—met Soviet experts, it became obvious that the Soviet side does not wish and cannot solve a single problem reasoning that Lithuania's political status should be solved first. Until they receive instructions from above about what Lithuania is in their view, and how to solve problems, they could only repeat that they were adhering to Soviet laws, and could do nothing.

Of course there is no doubt that they are right, but we see here some kind of a game: it is asserted at the level of the delegations that the teams of experts should negotiate and that the main political solution will become clear somewhat later, but the experts say quite the contrary. This is incompatible, and we pointed this out later to esteemed Nikolay Ryzhkov and his colleagues: that their stand was contradictory.

But later, after this wave of pressure that reached its peak with statements that Lithuania was the Soviet Union's republic, that all its legal acts were invalid, we asked them what had compelled us to sit here and conduct serious negotiation if our March 11 act was invalid. Then the talk continued on other matters. But after all there are also certain positive results.

Let us say that the teams of experts did not agree on anything positive about the recruitment of young people to the Soviet Army. But during the meeting of the delegations, after a long and stubborn exchange of opinions, it was decided that the problem could be handed over once again to the experts; that there could be extenuating circumstances; that they could serve in Lithuania; that people from certain groups of families or when a young man is married should not be recruited. Or about the alternative service. They did not refuse to talk about this. But once again, such an insignificant agreement was reached at a heavy price. This applies to other groups, too.

But looking at it more seriously, this should not provoke any astonishment or any pessimism. It has been foreseen that this would be so. It is essential to continue the talks, being serious and well prepared and persistent.

[Urbonas] Of course people are exhausted by this political tension. They are waiting impatiently for concrete results. Many people expect that a positive advance will be made soon, forgetting patience, will, concord, and endurance. How should people in Lithuania live and behave at this time, perhaps even waiting for the worst, if the negotiations that have not started do not take place?

[Kuzmickas] It is very improbable that negotiations will not start as the Soviet Union is interested in starting and continuing negotiations, perhaps expecting from the negotiations something completely different than what is expected by Lithuania. The concern of our people, and the expectation by all of us that negotiations will ease our situation, are understandable. But the Soviet side is also aware of this. It exerted pressure on us, intimidating us with difficulties and other misfortunes if we are obstinate and do not turn the negotiations in the direction of the Union treaty. If we do not give up everything that prompted not only Lithuania but the whole of East Europe to act.

We are going to face great difficulties. One must speak frankly and directly about this, and not because the proclamation of independence is to blame. I am convinced that if the restoration of independence were not proclaimed in Lithuania, and we remained integrated in the Soviet Union, the situation would not be better but worse because the situation is deteriorating both in Moscow and in other parts of the Soviet Union. We must understand that what is being experienced in Lithuania now is not the result of activity by Lithuania's politicians, but the unavoidable historical turning point experienced by all East European countries—which were building that unfortunate socialism, failed to build it, and now have to find the way out from this deadlock. The understanding by the people of the importance of this historical moment and of these unavoidable difficulties can only help us. But at the same time, a way out of this situation through attempts to establish trade and economic relations with individual parts of the Soviet Union, with its departments and other republics, is being looked into—because other republics are also interested in looking for a way out and in maintaining relations with Lithuania.

Therefore there is political pressure, and the political side of all this matter, and on the other hand an (?improvement) in the real state of affairs. I think that the progress of the negotiations will not improve our situation until the spring. I do not believe though that we will fall into something unknown, into some pit, because both our government and our parliament are working. This is in their power, that this transition be easier for people and that we experience less hardship.

[Urbonas] Let us hope that Lithuania will endure and that the people of Lithuania will help both parliament and the government.

[Kuzmickas] I think that at present, approaching the negotiations, the unity of all people in Lithuania, and their understanding of the importance of this moment and of the search for new efforts, is essential as never before so that we all can make our contribution to this issue so very important to all of us.

[Urbonas] I thank you.

Lithuania To Establish Economic Border Control

LD2310130290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Summary] It is intended to set up control points to protect the borders of Lithuania. According to Vaytkaltis, deputy general director of the Area Protection Department, there will be 64 border control points which will basically act as economic barriers for Lithuania.

Independence Party Wants Communists Disbanded

LD2310100190 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] The Independence Party, founded last weekend, has proclaimed itself a noncommunist party in a document of its constituent congress. In one of the resolutions, the Independence Party urges Lithuania's Supreme Council to pass laws which would proclaim all communist organizations in Lithuania criminal, and disband them, handing over their property to the state and authorizing the procurator's office to investigate their activities and punish those found guilty. The resolution demands that the leaders of those organizations not be allowed to occupy top posts in management structures of any level for several years. The resolution urges the Lithuanian Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, the Greens, the nationalists, the workers, deportees' unions and the Liberty League to rally against the corrupted functionaries of the old system.

Another resolution was adopted urging the government to resign because of errors committed.

Lithuania Approves Privatization Laws, Statutes

LD2310102190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene chaired today's Lithuanian Republic Government meeting. The government approved the Lithuanian Republic draft law on state property privatization and the draft proposals for establishment of a National Privatization Council and its subordinate service. Approval was also given to the draft proposal on the Lithuanian Communications Law. A resolution was adopted concerning economic reform of Lithuania's forestry economy. The government approved the statutes of the ministries of industry, communications, urban construction, and the Lithuanian Telegraph Agency.

Other questions were also discussed at the meeting.

Lithuania's Sajudis Deputies Hold Congress

91UN0089D Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 25 Sep 90 pp 2-3

[ELTA report: "A Congress of Deputies of Local Self-Governments of Sajudis"]

[Text] A congress of deputies of local self-governments nominated by the Lithuanian Sajudis movement took place 22-23 September at the trade union Republic Palace of Culture in Vilnius. Members of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council Presidium took part.

Opening the congress, the chairman of the Seimas Council of the Lithuanian Sajudis movement, Juozas Tumelis, noted that the representatives of local self-governments gathered at the congress constitute one of the wings of Sajudis. They are doing much work to accomplish the process of restoring real independence to Lithuania and creating a new republic. The purpose of the congress was to establish close ties between the Supreme Council deputies and the voters, and between the Sajudis structures and the deputies from Sajudis, on the one hand, and between the Supreme Council deputies on the other, and to define the boundaries of competence for local self-governments.

Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council, presented a report on the relations between the Supreme Council and the local self-governments.

The local self-governments are right there with the voters and have first-hand knowledge of people's problems, Vytautas Landsbergis noted. The overall situation in the republic depends to a great extent on their constructive work.

Local self-governments give expression to the initiatives coming from the people themselves. It goes without saying that contradictions may arise between the central authorities and local self-governments, but they should all be resolved by way of agreement rather than confrontation. Local self-governments should play an active part in drawing up laws, particularly those associated with the activities of city, rayon, and village self-government.

The Supreme Council chairman noted that among the questions that local self-governments should resolve, the problems of ownership and the budget are very important.

Vytautas Landsbergis emphasized that workers in local self-governments must be well aware of our difficult situation, and should intensify the fight against crime and speculators, concern themselves more with providing heat and food for the cities and rayons, and rebuff attempts to set the inhabitants of the city and the countryside one against the other.

Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, presented a report on the mutual relations between the government and the local self-governments. She noted that Lithuania's long existence in a condition without statehood had predetermined the fact that it is now extraordinarily difficult to achieve the kind of maturity needed now for state life. The flood of new forces into the newly created structures is still inadequately differentiated to deal with only one matter, discarding atypical random elements. If each of the subjects of authority concerns itself with defending its own estate at the expense of others, it will take us a long time to prove that we are a civilized state.

Relations between the government and local self-governments should gradually move to normal cooperation based on a delineation of competence and compliance with the law rather than on vertical, direct subordination.

The prime minister noted that the situation in the local self-governments that have been formed has been complicated by the fact that the legal basis for them—the Law on Self-Government—and the reality that they have inherited differ significantly.

Several days ago, Kazimiera Prunskiene said, agreement was reached between the government and mayors of cities governing the rayons to transfer enterprises, establishments, and organizations to the control of the local self-governments. I think that the plan agreed for this move will be adopted at a government meeting in the near future.

The prime minister dealt in detail with one especially important prerequisite for creating real local self-government, namely the budget and procedure for forming budget revenue, and also the right to independent use of assets. The government does not approve of the procedure whereby, when deductions of the same amount are imposed as excise duties and as income taxes from actual persons, all the local self-governments should receive a subsidy. It is also necessary to set up yet another staff position of deputy prime minister to deal with self-government affairs. She also emphasized the importance of contacts and information between the government and the local self-governments. A republic newspaper is also needed to study the problems of local self-government. We should already, right now, be concerning ourselves with training for workers in local self-governments.

The congress discussed questions pertaining to ownership, the budget, rights and guarantees for local self-governments, and problems relating to economic reform and the reorganization of trade. There was extensive discussion of questions relating to the creation of municipal police as the bastions of law and order, and abolishing the structures of the Lithuanian consumer cooperative since they do not meet the interests of consumers. A total of 17 resolutions was passed. In order to consolidate the activity of local self-governments and activate decisions for common problems, the congress decided to create a council to coordinate the activity of local self-governments in the Lithuanian Republic.

The chairman of the Sajudis Seimas Council, Juozas Tumelis, was the last to speak at the session.

Lithuania's Minorities Issues Examined

*91UN0089C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
22 Sep 90 p 2*

["A Meeting of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council Commission on Foreign Affairs"—EKHO LITVY headline]

[Text] An expanded meeting of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council Foreign Affairs Commission took place on 19 September 1990 at which political questions related to eastern Lithuania were discussed. The following guests were present at the meeting: Lithuanian

Republic Supreme Council Deputies R. Maceikianec (the Juodsiliai electoral district) and V. Suboc (the Svencioniai electoral district); Chairman of the Vilia Society K. Garsva; Chairman of the Vilnius Rayon Union of Poles in Lithuania J. Minczewicz; G. Songailia and S. Dusauskas-Duz, members of the State Commission for Eastern Lithuania; V. Cemkonas, member of the public commission on eastern Lithuania; and A. Krukauskiene, scientific associate at the Lithuania Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law.

The commission members stated that during the 50 years of Soviet occupation many political, economic, social, and cultural problems have built up in Lithuania, together with national problems. At this time forces hostile to the Lithuanian Republic are using national problems to destabilize the political situation in Lithuania on the eve of negotiations with the USSR. It was noted that the main political force in the Vilnius and Salcininkai rayons is the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) which is undoubtedly pursuing CPSU policy aimed at the territorial split of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and also particular republics of the USSR, and at creating new administrative-territorial units as part of the USSR. Members of the Foreign Affairs Commission are very alarmed by attempts to create a similar administrative-territorial unit in eastern Lithuania as part of the USSR. Deputies R. Maceikianec and V. Suboc also favored creating on the basis of the Salcininkai and Vilnius Rayons an administrative-territorial unit not as part of the USSR but as part of the Lithuanian Republic.

Members of the Foreign Affairs Commission stated that the deputies from Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons had still not declared their support for the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state and had still not recognized that the territory of the Lithuanian state is whole and indivisible, or that no constitution of another state is in force within it. It was the opinion of the commission members that this kind of public statement from the deputies from Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons would help stabilize the situation in Lithuania and resolve many political problems.

Questions related to the solution of the national problems of Lithuanians, Poles, Belorussians, and Russians in eastern Lithuania—and the creation of autonomous regions and future administrative-territorial redistribution in the Lithuanian Republic—were also discussed at the meeting. It was noted that in the administrative-territorial redistribution in eastern Lithuania it is essential to give due consideration to the opinion of the population.

Deputies R. Maceikianec and V. Suboc expressed the opinion that it will be necessary in the near future to meet with the leadership of the republic Supreme Council and Council of Ministers to discuss the problems arising in eastern Lithuania.

Representative of the Belorussians of Lithuania, S. Dusauskas-Duz, spoke out against the legitimation of several official languages in Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons. Those present at the meeting unanimously agreed that it is essential to expand the network of schools that teach in the native language in eastern Lithuania as quickly as possible.

[Signed] The Information Department of the Supreme Council.

100 'Beaten Up' in Clash Over Latvia Monument

LD2210221790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2100 GMT 22 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In Latvia, in the town of Jelgava, they do not seem to have a particularly favorable view of the presidential decree [on protecting monuments]. A Lenin monument has been pulled down. Many workers from large enterprises in Jelgava, as well as deputies from various soviets, attempted to prevent the monument being pulled down, in accordance with one of the USSR president's latest decrees incidentally. The situation was saved by so-called people's vigilantes, students of the Latvian agricultural academy, and the militia who helped them with truncheons. As a result of the action, the monument was taken down and around 100 citizens were beaten up, including several old people and people's deputies. That is how it was.

'Black Berets' Reject Order To Depoliticize

PM2310135290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Report from PRAVDA-TASS-INTERFAX roundup: "Riga"]

[Text] A special-purpose militia detachment has been described as mutinous by the Riga press. The point is that the "black berets" flatly refused to carry out the depoliticization order issued by Latvian Internal Affairs Minister A. Vaznis. At a meeting, Communists in the detachment decided not to halt the party organization's work. They have stuck to their decision to date. But the conflict with the minister has worsened meanwhile. The Latvian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] sent a message to the USSR MVD requesting that the 150-strong special-purpose militia detachment be reorganized. A quite different decision, however, was taken: By order of [USSR Internal Affairs Minister] V. Bakatin, the Latvian special-purpose detachment militiamen have been placed under the command of the USSR MVD Internal Troops.

Court Case Against Journalist Opens in Latvia

PM2310104290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by Irina Litvinova under "Direct Line" rubric: "Does the Press Announce the Verdict?"]

[Text] Riga—In the Latvian Supreme Court the trial has begun of Vladimir Kurmayev, own correspondent of the newspaper UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA for the Baltic republics.

The journalist is charged under Article 69 of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Criminal Code—"Violation of National and Racial Equality." This article is in the "State Crimes" section and stipulates a prison term of between six months and three years, or exile for a term of two to five years.

The case acquired publicity long before the beginning of the court hearing. The investigation lasted 18 months. There was a lull for another three and a half months after the case was referred to the court. Unlike the unhurried Law, the Latvian mass media, disregarding the presumption of innocence, have already long since pronounced the "verdict": guilty. V. Kurmayev has described the case as "open political provocation" and "revenge for the publication of articles against Latvia's separatists and extremists."

Bearing in mind the fact that "a court should be objective and absolutely protected against pressure from anyone," Kurmayev stated that he considers this "impossible in the current conditions in the Latvian republic." He has petitioned for the case to be transferred to the court of any other republic—except for the Baltic republics. The court collegium for criminal cases turned the petition down. Nevertheless, the hearing of the case has been deferred since the accused has so far been unable to exercise his right to judicial defense: So far none of Riga's lawyers has risked taking on the "dangerous case." At the last moment it became known that the Committee for the Defense of Civil Rights and the Constitution of the USSR and the Latvian SSR has decided to nominate a public defense attorney in the trial.

The Moscow attorney Plotnik, whom the newspaper contacted, stated after studying the case: "In all my legal practice I have never seen such a grossly falsified case."

Estonia's Economic Border Law Detailed

LD2310050890 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn October 23 TASS—The Estonian parliament on Monday passed a law "On the economic border of the Estonian Republic".

The law defines the economic border as a system of checkpoints for "protecting Estonia's internal market". They will be located on the line dividing this Baltic republic from its neighbours—Latvia and Russia.

As distinct from the initial draft, the law does not provide for the introduction of passport control and visa exchanges. These proposals were opposed by the population of Estonia's border areas.

However, some articles of the law give officials the right to check people's identity cards and deny entry to the republic for those not having such documents.

Preparations for the law's implementation began even before it was submitted to parliament. Customs officers and border guards are being trained.

The personnel of each of the 28 checkpoints, now being erected along the border, will include 16 to 18 volunteers from the Kodukaitse and Kaitseliit paramilitary groups.

21 Oct Session of Estonian Supreme Soviet Reported

LD2210122690

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1800 GMT on 21 October carries a five-minute report by Gunnar Paal on the 21 October session of the Estonian supreme Soviet in Tallinn

Rein Vare, minister of state, tells the reporter that preparations to set up border posts have been made and that from now on the law can be implemented. He thinks that the thousands of tonnes of goods which have so far been taken out of the republic will now be stopped.

The session also endorsed the decree of the presidium on public hoidays, with 64 votes in favor of the decree, 14 against, and one abstention. The following were endorsed as public holidays:
1 January, New Year
24 February, Estonian Independence Day
Good Friday
1 May, Day of Solidarity With Working People
23 June, Victory Day, anniversary of Battle of Vonnu
24 June, Jaanipaev
25 December, first day of Christmas
26 December, second day of Christmas

The following were endorsed as red-letter days without time off:
8 March, International Women's Day
First Day of Easter
9 May, Peace Day
Second Sunday in May, Mothers' Day
14 June, nationwide Day of Mourning, day of commemorating victims of Stalinist repressions
16 October, Day of Rebirth.

The decree originally also included a clause which would allow Russian-speaking collectives to decide their holidays differently, stemming from their religious beliefs, if they so wished; but once deputy Tiit Kabin explained that Estonians working within those collectives might lose their jobs if they failed to turn up at Christmas, if their collective had decided not to declare Christmas a holiday, the clause was voted out.

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings

22 Oct Session Reported

LD2210222290

Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1936 GMT on 22 October carries a 30-minute report on the 22 October session of the Russian Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet held in Moscow.

At 1936 GMT Rasskazov, chairman of the subcommittee for bank affairs, is interviewed on financial institutions. Yushchenkov, chairman of the subcommittee for the study of public opinion, is interviewed on recent trends. Rasskazov says the 500 days program is not practicable and that another program is needed. Yushchenkov wonders why Gorbachev changed his mind on the economic program and how Ryzhkov can have the nerve to stay, saying that perhaps others can imitate Yavlinskiy's example and resign. He notes that Ryzhkov's popularity rating is very low, and that unpopular measures combined with an unpopular government is a recipe for disaster.

The report moves to the committee for mass media where V.V. Ovcharov, deputy of the Krasnodar town soviet of people's deputies, and V.A. Yugin of the mass media committee, are interviewed about KRASNODARSKIY VECHER. An unidentified speaker is interviewed on how this paper works on a non-profit basis.

Poltoranin, RSFSR minister of the press and mass information, is interviewed next on how much power his institution has at this time, especialy due to paper shortages, etc.

The report ends at 2006 GMT.

Ovcharov, Yugin Interviewed

LD2310081390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with V.V. Ovcharov, deputy of Krasnodar town soviet of people's deputies, and V.A. Yugin, chairman of the Committee for Mass News Media, Relations with Public Organizations and Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion, by unidentified correspondent at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet sesson in the Kremlin on 22 October—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Yugin] Many of the central mass news media do not always objectively cover the progress of the sessions of the Russian legislature, the decisions, what problems are being discussed here, and what ways of deciding things are being found. That is the first thing. The second is that in the localities the local mass media for various reasons, primarily because they do not have their own correspondents but receive information from TASS or some other central sources, also do not quite objectively report to their readers, viewers, and listeners about the events which take place here and the tasks which the Russian parliament is trying to carry out.

Here is a specific example. I was approached by a representative from the town of Krasnodar about how things are with the existing mass media there, which generally try to objectively cover the problems of establishment of young soviet power, and how former party officials which have now moved to new desks try to suppress the emergence of such mass media. I think Vladimir from Krasnodar will tell you in more detail about this. I think it would not be a bad thing for Krasnodar people to listen to the worries being experienced by the young newspaper KRASNODARSKIYE IZVESTIYA, yes?

[Ovcharov] At the opening of the session of the town soviet of the town of Krasnodar the decision was taken to institute the newspaper KRASNODARSKIYE IZVESTIYA. At the present time, until the new year, the editorial office is working on a nonprofit basis. From 1 November it will come out once a week. Until now it has been coming out once every two weeks. From the new year subscriptions have been started and from the new year it will come out five days a week. Subscriptions are being made—compared with the levels they are going throughout the country, not exactly brilliantly so far. The paper is so far coming out occasionally on a nonprofit basis really. We have great difficulties with the printing facilities. In principle, we have printing facilities in the town. But they come under the administration of the kray printing board. The town soviet decided to transfer these printing facilities to the ownership of the town soviet. The labor collective has agreed to this. But the leader of the kray printing board, Comrade Soloshenko, creates every obstacle in the way of the transfer of this property. Recently he started creating a new structure of the whole printing facilities with the same management, a so-called concern which will leave the same structure under the same management.

[Yugin] And here is something interesting. I know this Soloshenko. On a business trip we were talking about problems of the kray's mass media and he asked who would control the ideology of a particular newspaper. A representative of soviet power asks: Who will control the ideology? I asked him what ideology he meant, and he said communist morality. So a man who has moved from a party desk to an administration desk continues to keep his convictions unchanged without feeling the way of life that is really being lived in every house, apartment, every person. There are many such examples. [passage omitted]

We are now doing everything to return the printing facilities to the soviets, to create a fund for actions of all parties, all movements, an equitable fund without allocating anything to a particular ideology. The main principle is that it should be all-human ideology. That is why we have gathered for our seminar representatives, or rather chairmen of committees and commissions for glasnost of all Russia.

[Correspondent] How unanimous are you?

[Yugin] We can already sense it. The unanimity here is felt in one thing: that mass media are needed and what the party once took must be returned to the peoples' soviets. Methods and forms and approaches, etc. are another matter. These need to be studied carefully.

Poltoranin Interviewed

LD2310081990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with Mikhail Poltoranin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) minister of the press and mass media, by unidentified correspondent at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 22 October—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mikhail Nikiforovich, how seriously are you hoping for assistance from the chairmen of the mass media committees of the oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies? They no doubt have as few rights as the RSFSR Supreme Soviet which has no real power—neither printing presses, nor the money, nor the newsprint. Nothing.

[Poltoranin] We are not so much hoping for assistance as for advice. That is why we have got them together—finally to see each other face to face and to discuss where to go from here. To be honest, I did not expect that locally our printing facilities, and generally the material and technical resources of the news media, were also so indigent and poor. I thought it was only like that in Moscow. We battled here to get some sort of facilities, and as you will know we obtained a certain amount. We signed an agreement with the CPSU Central Committee, with the administration of affairs, the outcome of which was that we get 40 per cent of the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA publishing house, and on that basis we are going to put out our own papers—our Russian parliamentary newspaper ROSSIYSKIY VESTNIK and the weekly EKHO SOBYTIY.

And so I came over, and we got together all these colleagues of ours to get them to attempt to help us to set up this democratic Russian soviet press. And it turns out they have even more problems than we have because there are no resources there, no newsprint, no this and no that. So we are at the moment seeking some points of contact. After all, we have to implement the decisions of the Russian Supreme Soviet session.

Today the issue of the presidential decree on ownership has emerged as very controversial. And here Mikhail Aleksandrovich Fedotov, deputy minister of press and mass media—he is a lawyer and doctor of law on public organizations, that is the alternative laws—explained that the law was not an obstacle. Quite the reverse, all the problems need to be tackled on the basis of this decree. That is, one must marshal all arguments to prove that these publishing houses belonged to the state, they were subsequently expropriated by the party committes, they must simply be returned to the owner who built them up and invested resources in them, and that other owners are today unlawfully using them.

[Corrdespondent] Mikhail Nikiforovich, do you think that Russian Communications minister Boris Vasilyevich Bulgakov is being too optimistic by half when he says it is all simple, there are no problems, everything exists, the channels exist, the satellites have been ordered, and everything is fine. You announced today that the building for Russian television has already been allocated on (?Pyataya Yamskaya) street. But that is not enough. You need equipmnet, hardware, editorial offices, and different services. There is a vast, colossal amount of work to be done.

[Poltoranin] I would not quite agree with you that it is optimistic. Bulgak is responsible for his industry. Vladimir Borisovich Bulgak was probably right to be optimistic because I would say that everything is all right in his industry. The fact that we have a shortage of studio equipment today, the fact that the organizational question of the channel has not been sorted out—that is for the all-Russian radio and television broadcasting company.

[Correspondent] It somehow went on the air rather quietly and unnoticed. Did you get that impression?

[Poltoranin] No, I noticed it. We came to the conclusion that these would be editions number zero. Newspapers have issues number zero, and this was edition number zero of our all-Russian television company. At the same time, one should not drag out these zero editions: it is high time to take the second program. The point is, as Bulgak was saying, that there is a developed television network on the territory of Russia—at least as far as transmitters and receivers are concerned—and all this is the property of Russia.

And as always, there is of course the traditional method whereby we could share out what Gosteleradio has. But just examine what Gosteleradio has.

[Correspondent] What poverty!

[Poltoranin] Yes, just look at those cameras! That is not the way, of course. So we have to seek sponsors abroad, we have to seek partners abroad, and attract foreign investment, and on that basis build up our resources. We have picked the second method, although in the first instance we will no doubt have to take something in order to start broadcasting.

23 Oct Session Reported

LD2310124190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report on the 23 October plenary session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet in Moscow by correspondent Andrey Nikiforov—live]

[Text] Good afternoon. Yes, there is a plenary sitting, and the agenda is rather intensive. Deputies are intending to examine in the second reading the draft of the standing orders of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and the draft bill on economic links in 1991. But the first draft bill which was examined just now, before the short interval, is the draft bill on the application of acts of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the territory of the Russian Federation.

I will note, however, that before the deputies directly began their lawmaking activity, Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia, delivered a short speech to them. He dwelled on the question of to what extent the present situation is affecting the implementation of Russia's economic program. He stressed that Russia wants to assume economic responsibility, and incidentally that is in line with the Basic Guidelines on the transition to the market which the Supreme Soviet of the Union adopted, and that desire must be helped and not on the contrary [as heard].

Touching upon the recent statement by the chairman of the supreme soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and the reaction to it on the part of the president of the USSR, Comrade Khasbulatov stressed that the main appeal continued in the statement by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was the appeal for consolidation.

Let us turn to the draft law on the application of the acts of the USSR on the territory of the Russian Federation. Essentially, that is the first document directed at defending the sovereignty of the republic. Why is that law necessary especially now?

Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakray, chairman of the committee on legislation [Committee on Legality and Order Maintenance and Struggle Against Crime], addressing the deputies and describing that draft bill, said that the country's Supreme Soviet had adopted an important document, the Basic Guidelines, but within the framework of that document had implemented both the 500 days program and the government program may be implemented. It all depends upon the team, upon those executing power. He said that at the moment it remains as before. At the same time, it is stated in the Basic Guidelines that the main burden of economic reform rests on the republics. That contradiction between the need for the center to help the republics comprehensively in the transition to the market and the presence of the former Union government makes for the urgency of that law.

Now a few words about what it provides for. In particular, acts and bodies of the USSR operate on the territory of the Russian Federation unless they have been suspended by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet or the RSFSR Council of Ministers in accordance with the declaration of state sovereignty. Decisions of state bodies operating on the territory of Russia, adopted or implemented on the basis of acts of bodies of the USSR, neither approved nor confirmed or suspended in accordance with these laws, are null and void.

But the question of liability for the violation—well, of clauses of that law—is provided for. Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakray, the main rapporteur on the law, as I said did not come down from the rostrum for approximately 1 hour and a half. He was replying to deputies' questions. Then there was a short discussion. It will continue now after the short break.

Deputies Deny Writing Yeltsin's Speech for Him

PM2210161990 Moscow KOMSOMOLKSAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by unidentified TASS correspondent carried in "Parliamentary Week" column under heading "Incidentally": "A FanTASStic Story?"]

[Text] In connection with the publication in some newspapers of TASS correspondent N. Veterin's item "They Wrote the Speech at Night," TASS has received a letter from O.G. Rumyantsev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Committee for Mass Media, which, in the name of USSR People's Deputies A.M. Obolenskiy and N.D. Tutov and RSFSR People's Deputies V.V. Dmitriyev and O.G. Rumyantsev, refutes the suggestion in the item that B.N. Yeltsin's speech at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session was prepared by them.

"This assertion has no relation to the truth and was not made by the deputies," the letter says.

RSFSR Politburo Calls for 7 Nov Celebration

PM2310124990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Appeal by RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo: "In RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution is approaching. The date of 7 November is a holiday which has always been celebrated as the birthday of the state in which the working people took power into their own hands.

The appeals which are being heard to renounce the celebration of the holiday can only be assessed as an attempt to "repeal," to erase from the people's memory the proletarian revolution whose historical significance is recognized throughout the world, as an attempt to discredit the Russian people's socialist choice, as an attempt to reject our idea which expresses the universal human aspirations to a just structure for society.

A society which does not respect its history and preceding generations is a society without a future.

The present celebration of 7 November will mean support for the course toward the renewal of socialism, the strengthening of the USSR as a single state, and the consolidation of all those who hold our Motherland dear and for whom the interests of the working people and each Soviet person are indeed important.

The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Politburo urges all Russian Communists and all working people, veterans, and young people to take part on this day in demonstrations under the slogans of support for the socialist content of perestroyka, the people's power, the friendship of the peoples, civil peace and consensus, and the introduction of democratic law and order. The opportunity to work creatively and certainty in the morrow and in one's future are so necessary today to each family and to all honest people.

We appeal to the soviets of people's deputies, the Communists, representatives of other parties, and nonparty people working in them to take an active part in organizing and holding a nationwide celebration of Great October, the day of the victory of the working people who established the power of the Soviets. Now this power must be renewed and strengthened. In the interests of the working person, the citizen of our republic, and the whole country!

[Signed] The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo.

Special People's Deputies Session Requested

LD2210173790 Moscow TASS in English 1709 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Presidium of the Russian Parliament today suggested that the Supreme Soviet legislature convene a special Congress of People's Deputies, the higher legislative authority, in Moscow on November 27.

It also decided to form a special parliamentary commission to prepare the congress.

The presidium met behind closed doors. Asked by reporters about the congressional agenda, a parliamentary press official said it was yet to be discussed.

Deputy Interviewed on Draft of New Constitution

PM2210113590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with S. Baburin by V. Litvin: "Why Hurry? Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) People's Deputy S. Baburin's Opinion on the Draft Russian Federation Constitution"]

[Text] Work on the new RSFSR Constitution is entering its final stage. It is a difficult birth for this document of major importance to our republic, amid conflicting approaches and opinions. We offer readers a conversation with RSFSR People's Deputy Sergey Nikolayevich Baburin, member of the republic's Supreme Soviet and dean of the law department at Omsk State University.

[Litvin] During the discussion of the draft Constitution your opinion contrasted sharply with the attitude of others, who were resolutely "pro"....

[Baburin] Not just mine. RSFSR People's Deputy S.A. Glotov was skeptical about the document. RSFSR People's Deputy Yu.M. Slabodkin's words were very strong, although unfortunately not entirely fair. Indeed, there were critical remarks from other deputies. But you are right that the majority saw the foundation of it as entirely acceptable. It is undeniable that the Constitutional Commission working group has done a great deal of multifaceted and useful work. The draft is very interesting, I would even say original. But it is hardly suitable for our republic.

Russia is a state with its own unique and long history, traditions, culture, and customs. The submitted document, if you will forgive my strong words, is written in the style of a naive imitation of Western liberalism which did well 100 years ago in France and Germany, for example, but naturally never took the specific features of Russia into account. Any attempt to transfer Western standards automatically to Russian soil could have the totally opposite effect. There has been a multitude of examples of this in recent years.

[Litvin] How exactly have the specific features of Russia been ignored, in your view?

[Baburin] Unfortunately, the authors got carried away by the recommendations of A. Rapashinskiy who stresses in his memorandum the need for a complete break with Soviet and socialist terminology. In fact "Soviet," "socialist," "Supreme Soviet," and so on are not mentioned at all in the text. They have even disappeared from the name of the state, even though on this matter the opinion of the majority of the people really should be sought first—after all, it is a question of the nature of a political system, albeit distorted and riddled with flaws, that has existed here for many decades. I foresee accusations of "conservatism", but one cannot ignore—indeed it is dangerous to ignore—the experience of one's own country and the historical, political, and in fact psychological realities that have been established in it. After all we are not talking about an uninhabited island but about a state with a unique history and culture, about a people who, for all their problems, have made and are making a contribution to world civilization that is as great and sometimes greater than that of others.

The undoubted scholarly erudition of the members of the working group played a dirty trick on them, in my opinion: Fascinated with a political model based on bourgeois democratic structures, they lost touch with their own soil—the restoration of the term "State Duma" to the Constitution is no salvation—and with today's specific historical situation. I say this with regret because the working group includes progressive, democratically minded deputies and unorthodox thinkers: O.G. Rumyantsev, L.B. Volkov, R.I. Pimenov, Yu.A. Ryzhov, V.L. Sheynis, F.V. Shelov-Kovedyayev, and others. There are also some eminent people with expert knowledge. By and large, the draft could be called a symptom of the fact that we are dizzy from "democratic successes."

[Litvin] At the session you said that the draft essentially destroys the unified Russian state. Is that a bit strong?

[Baburin] It is too soft. For example, I have major or minor criticisms to make of many sections of the Constitution, but the section on the future federative arrangement is totally unacceptable as far as I am concerned. And since it is the very foundation on which the entire edifice of the Basic Law rests, then I am against the adoption of the draft. A few specific examples.

According to the draft, the Russian Republic—no matter what other adjective they attach to it: "Soviet," "socialist"—disappears and is replaced by the Russian Federation which "consists of national territorial and regional entities that have the legal constitutional status of equal republics and federal territories" (Article 4.1.1).

If you think that by republics they mean today's Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics, you are mistaken. Article 4.1.2 says: "The federation entities—republics, krays, oblasts, lands, and so on—that make up the Russian Federation choose their own name independently for national, traditional or other reasons." In other words, long live the Moscow, Siberian, Yaroslavl, and other principalities! Sorry, republics.

The neofeudal fragmentation would merit the attention of the author of a new "Lay of Igor's Host." Indeed, any component of the federation would be able to establish its own citizenship (Article 4.4.1). And Novgorod citizenship or Yaroslavl citizenship would be revived at last! The legislation of the components of the federation—republics, krays, oblasts, lands, and so on!—would determine the procedure for electing deputies of representative organs of republics and organs of local self-government (Article 5.6.6).

[Litvin] What exactly are you proposing?

[Baburin] Stopping this crazy race which can only be prejudicial to the cause. Obviously one wants to resolve all the neglected problems as quickly as possible because time is pressing. But at the end of the day everything must be done throughly and properly, without cheap political effects and gestures intended for an undemanding public.

First of all, and this was pointed out by people's deputy S.A. Glotov, it is necessary to carry out the instructions of the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and prepare draft amendments to the existing RSFSR Constitution. All the fundamental ideas of the future Basic Law, the delimitation of powers, and the institution of President should be incorporated in the existing RSFSR Constitution. Let us test them on the basis of today's realities. Moreover, I believe it is futile to try to create an "everlasting" constitution in a period of crisis. Social relations must first be crystallized and cleansed. Moreover no Constitution can bring civil peace and national accord. It can only consolidate them.

It irks me, to be frank: After all, we can—by virtue of our body of deputies and because of the firmness and resolution of our parliament's leadership—work far more effectively than the Union parliament. Yet the errors continue.... Perhaps we should pay a fraction of the attention to sending ultraradical laws and resolutions on up, while paying correspondingly greater attention to meticulously elaborating them, and in particular checking and monitoring those that have been adopted. And pay greater heed to the people's opinion. How, specifically? Bring the competition among draft constitutions to a conclusion, again without undue haste, and conduct an extensive public discussion of them while establishing, in a referendum, the people's opinion of the principles of the Basic Law, and only then prepare the final text of a constitution and submit it for nationwide approval.

[Litvin] Has this discussion and consideration of the variety of opinion not taken place?

[Baburin] Alas I must reply in the negative. As it happens, only the members of the working group who are not in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet were in fact able to work on the draft Constitution. A considerable proportion was unable to interrupt its work in chambers and on committees. And whereas unanimity was a rare visitor to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session, it was all harmony and unity among the authors of the draft. Although when RSFSR people's deputies Doctors of Legal Sciences O.I. Tiunov and N.T. Vedernikov and I went to see the compilers of the draft, looked at the text, and raised several fundamental points, we were told that they had already been tackled and it was impossible to go back to them. In short, the juggernaut was on the move and the draft was ready. Once again we were prisoners of the monopoly on truth which had plagued everyone in the past.

Incidentally I am not sure we are talking about a majority monopoly. The draft even caused confusion at the Constitutional Commission session and it was not adopted as the basic document. The question was not even put to a vote. For the sake of the antiquated "unity at all costs" and a semblance of compromise at least, it was taken as a "working" basis. What this means I can only guess. And no other draft was examined, of course.

Why not discuss two or three drafts and then submit them for extensive public discussion, by publishing them in the press for instance? What we have is a one-sided pluralism....

[Litvin] But is this "gradualism" not going to lead to a loss of pace, to our falling behind the rapidly developing events in the country?

[Baburin] Do not confuse politics with a stadium running track. Even there the one who takes the lead does not always finish first. In itself the appearance of a new constitution, even an ideal one, which is a long way off yet, would solve none of our numerous problems. If the legally faultless wording of paragraphs and articles of legislative acts were to automatically fill store shelves with food or industrial products we would be far richer in these items than any Western country. Moreover, in the present situation the radical dismantling of the established constitutional and state structures would only intensify the chaos and confusion and add fuel to the fire of social and indeed ethnic tension.

All our attention must now be devoted to the economy. Political democracy must let economic democracy through. We simply do not have the right to waste time and effort on experiments with new elections to some State Duma or even to a Constitutional Assembly. All attention must be focused on economic reform. That is the purpose of the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Only the absolutely essential changes should be made to the RSFSR Constitution. And a new RSFSR Basic Law must be adopted within 500 days. Then it could actually be a law of realism and national accord.

Coverage of 'Democratic Russia' Founding Congress

Proceedings Viewed

PM2310132690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by T. Panina and Yu. Yuryev under the rubric "On the Political Map": "Has a Choice Been Made?"]

[Text] We got to the constituent congress of the "Democratic Russia" movement, which was held in the "Rossiya" movie theater, by passing through a procession of people lining up facing each other and holding posters and banners with alternative messages on them, so to speak.

Some of them said: "The People Trust the Russian Parliament—the People Despise the Center and the Union Parliament." Others said "No to Market Hazards! We Will Not Allow Russia To Be Turned into a Colony!" But these are extremes, rally euphoria, and the spontaneity of the "mob" clearing the air with the help of its vocal chords.

And what was happening in the hall?

As was announced, over 2,000 representatives of various parties and social and sociopolitical organizations from various regions in the country came to the congress. They included the Russian Democratic Party; the Democratic Platform; the Russian Peasant Party; the Constitutional-Democratic Party; the Party of Constitutional Democrats; and also "Aprel," "Memorial," and others.

Opening the congress USSR People's Deputy A. Murashev, chairman of the organizational committee, stated: "We see our movement as an alternative to the CPSU line."

Russian People's Deputy O. Rumyantsev, leader of the social democratic party, described the situation even more specifically: "There are two parties—'them' and 'us.'"

And so the distribution of forces has been determined. Can we start working? But how? The participants in the congress were not unanimous on this point. The representatives of various parties and movements made their statements and these were sometimes mutually exclusive. What path should democracy take today? The path of creating strong political structures, according to N. Travkin, chairman of the Russian Democratic Party, or organizing a broad mass movement which has already proved itself in East European countries, and which V. Lysenko, leader of the Democratic Platform, is calling for. In his appeal to the delegates to the congress, G. Popov, chairman of Moscow City Soviet, called for a center-left coalition which should be formed without delay, "within two weeks."

There were also serious debates both days about the new movement's statutes. In the end they were adopted in their entirety. They state that "the 'Democratic Russia' movement is a mass sociopolitical organization which brings together parties, social organizations, and other formations and individual citizens on a voluntary basis. The movement's task is to coordinate actions in uniting democratic forces to carry out progressive, radical political and socioeconomic reforms in Russia with the aim of creating a civic society." Furthermore, the statutes affirm officially that "Democratic Russia" is the opposition to the CPSU.

Well, so be it. But does the movement thus not close its doors to millions of rank-and-file Communists, excluding them from participating in the democratization of society? After all, there were Communists even among the delegates to the congress. Are we to understand that they are faced with the condition of leaving the party...?

Thus a new mass movement has been created. They have their statutes and they have their official symbol—the

Russian national tricolor. Admittedly they do not have a political program. As O. Rumyantsev noted, the provisions of the new RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] constitution will become the program.

The congress also adopted a number of political resolutions. Their basic demands are: the resignation of the Union government, support for radical reforms in Russia, the holding of nationwide elections for the RSFSR president, the depoliticization of the law enforcement organs, and the nationalization of CPSU property.

Apart from this, the congress proposed to declare 7 November a day of remembrance for the victims of communist terror and a day of mass reconciliation.

You can react in various ways to the documents adopted by the congress and declare yourself to be "for" or "against," but I would like to draw attention to the contradiction between the statements about the need for civil consensus and stabilization of the situation in the country, and the proposed measures: strikes and other acts of mass insubordination throughout the republic's territory. And this at such an uneasy time in a society that is already stretched to the utmost.

Decisions Reported

PM2310133190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by Aleksandr Davydov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "'Democratic Russia' Adopts Decision"]

[Text] Moscow—A new mass movement, "Democratic Russia," has started operating in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]—this was resolved by the movement's constituent congress which completed its work in Moscow 21 October.

The statutes state: "Democratic Russia" is a mass social organization voluntarily uniting parties, social organizations, other formations, and individual citizens. The movement's task is to coordinate actions to unite democratic forces for the implementation of progressive radical political and socioeconomic reforms in Russia with a view to creating a civilian society. Every collective member of the movement is guaranteed independence in determining its own strategy and tactics. That is, "Democratic Russia" does not have a single common political program. As one of the movement's leaders, RSFSR People's Deputy O. Rumyantsev noted, "Democratic Russia's" action program must be the provisions of the new constitution to be ratified at the upcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

The movement's leadership bodies—the Council of Representatives and Coordinating Council—do not yet exist either. They are yet to be formed in the course of elections, which are to be held at local level taking account of prescribed quotas. "Democratic Russia's" symbol is the Russian national tricolor. The movement's statutes state: "'Democratic Russia' is in opposition to the CPSU."

The congress ended with the adoption of a number of resolutions on topical political questions. The main demands expressed in the resolutions are: the resignation of the Union government—a campaign of acts of mass disobedience throughout the republic's territory is to be organized in support of this demand, and a separate resolution is devoted to this; support for the Russian parliament's course aimed at radical economic reform; the transfer of CPSU property to the people; and the speediest holding of general elections for a president of Russia. The congress proposed declaring 7 November a day of remembrance for the victims of communist terror and mass reconciliation.

A resolution was also adopted calling for the depoliticization of law-enforcement agencies and urging their personnel to refuse to use weapons against their own people.

RSFSR Communist Party Statement

PM2310090690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

["Statement by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] In connection with the Founding Congress of the "Democratic Russia" Movement, which opens on 20 October 1990, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party Central Committee considers it necessary to state its desire to cooperate with all democratic forces in the republic for the purpose of consolidation, stabilization of the economy, implementation of democratic transformations, and achievement of civil accord.

Representatives of the many parties and organizations in "Democratic Russia" participated in the work of the first and second stages of the Founding Congress of the RSFSR Central Committee and some of them addressed the congress. We representatives of the RSFSR Communist Party hope to have a reciprocal invitation and to be able to participate in the work of the Founding Congress of the "Democratic Russia" movement.

Presidium Approves Use of Food Coupons in Moscow

LD2210232890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] A document approved by the Presidium of the capital's soviet today provides for instituting coupons for main foodstuffs in Moscow. It has to pass the forthcoming session of the Moscow soviet in November. This measure is considered to be necessary for social protection of the population during the transition to the market. Thus the session has the final say. But the first bell which announced that the capital is preparing for a coupon system has sounded.

Another important principle of the draft is that introduction of the coupon system should be accompanied by the development of free enterprises without fail. It is supposed that the food supplied to Moscow will be strictly regulated in accordance with the population. The deputies of the city and rayon soviets should control its distribution. But they will be able to sell everything that the business owners buy in other regions—at prices that are higher than those at present—at prices that would allow them to gain profit. The Moscow Soviet's task in this case will consist of developing an efficient tax system that would control market relations. What is meant by this? If the business owners try to inflate prices for their goods they will be pressed by a progressive tax. The money received will be used to give subsidies to the Muscovities. And generally the enterprises, even if they are free, should stipulate certain responsibility for social protection of citizens.

As far as prices are concerned, nobody made a secret of the fact that they will be increased. They government has decided to increase purchase prices for agricultural products which cannot help leading to retail price increases. If the final decision on introducing the coupons in the capital is made, the Presidium of the Moscow soviet will apply the the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet with a recommendation to spread them with the simultaneous development of free trade throughout Russia.

Why is this point so important? Answering a TASS correspondent's question Solomatin, chairman of the Moscow Soviet's permanent commission for Consumer Market of Goods and Services, said if it is not put into practice then the critical situation with the city's supplies that arose at the beginning of September may reoccur. Moscow cannot be isolated from the republican wholesale market.

The Presidium of the Moscow soviet has also examined a draft resolution on the principles of privatization and abolition of state ownership of enterprises of the local industries and the sphere of services. According to the document, the small- and medium-size enterprises should be involved in this process in the first place. Protection is needed against attempts to retain an obsolete administrative system of management under the new signboards. The draft will be submitted to the session of the capital's soviet after it is completed.

Coverage of Moscow City Party Committee Plenum

Prokofyev Addresses Plenum

91UN0082A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 pp 2-3

[Speech by Yu.A. Prokofyev at 5 October 1990 Moscow Gorkom Plenum]

[Text] Comrades!

The assembling of today's gorkom [city party committee] plenum was prompted by the need to discuss on the eve of the impending Central Committee plenum the most acute political situation in the country and in the city. The Central Committee has to chart the paths to extricate society from the crisis and express the party's attitude toward the plans for the transfer of the economy to a market track.

The country has approached the implementation of radical economic reform from an extremely aggravated situation in the economy, in the state structures, and in the mood of society.

It is hard to disagree with those who are persistently drawing analogies between the present time and what occurred between February and October 1917. Truly today we are living through that same infinite mass-meeting spontaneity, the emergence of a multitude of parties and movements and that same chaos of lax management; strikes and stoppages are erupting; and the bonfires of national conflicts are blazing. Political extremism has assumed unprecedented proportions and the anticommunist mood is growing. The calls for a change in the social and political arrangement of the state are already being buttressed by acts of provocation. There is no denying that people have lost confidence in the future and are worried for their children. The present state of affairs, in the city included, cannot be defined other than as precatastrophic.

And in this situation we are concerned to a greater extent not with the party's self-preservation, but with man's fate. Never in recent decades has his life been as difficult as it is now. Unfortunately the immediate prospects are also joyless. The store counters are just as bare as the city's evening streets. People are weighed down by the fear of a hungry winter and are frightened by the orgy of crime. The city's granaries have not yet been filled. The potato harvest grown in the Moscow area is perishing in the inclement weather.

For various reasons, regions that traditionally send agricultural produce to Moscow are failing to meet their commitments in full. There has been a shortfall since the start of the year of approximately 80,000 tonnes in the supply of meat products, more than 20,000 tonnes of sugar, 117 million eggs, and much else.

People are literally getting it on the one hand by the stifling shortage of all types of commodities, and on the other by the exorbitant prices at the markets, in the commission stores, and in cooperative trade.

The measures to stabilize the capital's commodity market being adopted by the city authorities are not helping. Nothing other than an intensification of the anti-Moscow mood has been produced by the introduction of customers' shopping cards. Up to one-third of edible and up to one-half of industrial commodities are, as before, being taken outside of Moscow. And this given that the Moscow City Soviet has from its own stocks voluntarily transferred more than 100,000 tonnes of meat products for distribution among neighboring oblasts. The groundlessness of these measures, which at first sight seemed a panacea for Muscovites, is now obvious to everyone.

The gorkom foresaw such a turn of events and attempted to warn the leaders of the Moscow City Soviet and the city soviet executive committee [gorispolkom] against decisions undermining the authority of Moscow and incapable of rectifying matters. But it was not heeded, unfortunately.

Nor is the preparation of the city for the winter going well. We can only hope today that the coming winter will be as mild as possible. We cannot fail to share the serious concern expressed by a group of the capital's power engineers in the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA on 14 September of this year. The suspension under the pressure of "mass-meeting democracy" of the installation of the Severnyy Heat and Electric Power Station, and the foiling of the construction of a whole number of other power facilities, could lead to extraordinary consequences in the future. But even now the shortage of thermal energy in Moscow's northern districts is such that if the temperature drops below minus 25, it will be no higher than plus 15 in the apartments. Do we really have to completely freeze and once again take the route of the small stove and firewood in order to come to our senses?

The housing problem is intensifying. It is conclusively clear even now that fulfillment of the "Housing 2000" social program has come to grief. Of course this program was adopted in other times. But its purpose is a humane one—providing each family with a separate apartment. And there is no way toward this other than an appreciable increase in the amount of construction. Now, however, owing to malfunctions in the city's production line for construction, Muscovites will experience a shortfall in the supply of housing of more than 20,000 well-appointed apartments this year alone. Fulfillment of the plans to provide housing in the neighborhoods and at enterprises will be 40-45 percent at best. Specialists estimate that in 1991 the housing waiting list in the city will lengthen to 1.4 million persons and that the wait will be 11-12 years. Behind these figures are people's unrealized hopes.

Unfortunately, problems connected with the package of decisions pertaining to the privatization of housing and payment for housing and the conditions of its utilization may be added to the difficulties of the development of the capital's housing industry.

The Moscow Gorkom Bureau believes that it is necessary via the deputies, primarily the "Moscow" group, to strive for balanced consideration in the solution of such important questions as the transfer of apartments into Muscovites' ownership and the establishment of a just system of payment for housing depending on its quality and at the same time to protect the townspeople against a multiple rent increase.

It cannot be permitted that people find themselves in the hopeless situation of either starving to keep their dwellings or going without a roof over their heads in order to somehow subsist. This is fraught with the danger of serious social upheavals.

The city's inhabitants need to be spared the psychological stresses and physical strains of everyday Moscow life. The city's authorities have yet to get a grip on the situation.

Salt, soap, macaroni, sugar, and tobacco booms are coming one after another. People are justified in suspecting that this is not without the mafia, which is undoubtedly getting rich on this. Nor can we fail to see a direct connection between the inability to manage and the turbulent activity of the shadow economy where the breakdowns have occurred. And their number is increasing.

The soviets in Moscow have obtained power. But power predetermines responsibility also. However, we are essentially in a vacuum of both power and responsibility. The new soviets are not yet capable of encompassing the whole set of issues full-bloodedly and with profound knowledgeability. In this situation, the party organizations and committees, without substituting for the soviets, should still find forms of influencing the production sphere, solving socioeconomic questions, and acting in accordance with the situation.

You know that recent sessions of the obkom [oblast committee] bureau discussed questions on the exacerbation of the political situation in connection with the unsatisfactory solution in Moscow of a number of vitally important socioeconomic problems in connection with the complex crime-conducive situation.

It was primarily a question of the responsibility of the communist leaders of municipal services for the state of affairs in the areas of work entrusted to them. The agenda was dictated not by attempts to once again insert ourselves in the direct mechanisms of management and administration, but by an endeavor to collectively find approaches to the solution of urgent problems, jointly uncover potential, and determine how to commission it.

The Communists' participation in harvesting was discussed in the bureau also. There was support for the initiative of the primary organizations concerning each CPSU member working no less than three days in the fields of the Moscow area. As you know, the first to join in this work were the delegates to the city and rayon party conferences, and gorkom and raykom [rayon party committee] officials are going to the fields regularly.

The gorkom has requested that the leaders of the Communist Parties and the soviet authorities of a number of fraternal republics set up additional supplies to Moscow of vegetables and fruit. There has already been a positive response from Uzbekistan. They are prepared to send thousands of tonnes of watermelons, sweet melons, pomegranates, onions, carrots, beets and turnips, and 3.5

million cans of fruit and vegetables. Representatives of the Moscow Main Administration for Fruit and Vegetable Industry are awaited in Kazakhstan also. The republic is preparing to send Moscow 10,000 tonnes of watermelons and 4,000 tonnes of grapes.

This was reported in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. It is not self-advertising. People should have reliable information about who is doing what. The more so now, when one frequently hears talk to the effect that the party is sabotaging the measures being adopted by the soviets and deliberately tripping them up to demonstrate their bankruptcy before the electorate.

There is no need for us to cause division. We have one Moscow. The problems are common. They need to be solved together. And it is, to be honest, puzzling when there is a childishly envious attitude toward our specific initiatives and actual deeds. It can be seen with what prejudice some people in our present soviets perceive all that is supported by the Communists. But a politician's wisdom and maturity consist not of a new ideological monopolism but of a capacity for accepting everything that is to the people's benefit.

The soviets must stand on their own two feet and become a genuine instrument of democratic authority in the city. Of course, there is still much to be perfected in their structure. Legislative separation of the levels of jurisdiction of the city and rayon soviets is necessary. It would be in the interests of the cause to more rapidly and precisely draw a line of demarcation between the soviets and their executive authorities to prevent their substituting for one another. It is our belief that it is on these paths that it is possible to build a strong soviet authority in the city.

A law on the status of Moscow should serve as a reliable foundation. As you know, the gorkom formerly sponsored its elaboration. It was supported by the president of the country and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium which formed a commission for preparation of a draft of the corresponding document. It is important not to dawdle with this matter.

As far as the proposals concerning a new administrative division of Moscow are concerned, this could hardly be effected painlessly without a loss of manageability of the municipal economy. The saying "look before you leap" is more appropriate than ever here. It has to be considered also that we are dealing not simply with a number of rayon units but with the fate of the rayon soviets of people's deputies elected to the soviets democratically for the first time, on a multiple-choice basis. Otherwise this will look like an attack on democracy.

A most dangerous situation that has taken shape in the country is anarchy. But it cannot go on for long; society cannot continue to be kept in a state of heightened tension. The release could come unexpectedly and bring to the surface political forces that are far from the ideals of democracy, social justice, and respect for the standards of a state based on the rule of law. And there are examples of this in world history. Under conditions where the Communists and social democrats were unable to overcome the contradictions, fascists came to power in Germany.

From the mood in the work force one senses that people are tired of the promises and their ever-deteriorating lives. On the one hand, this is engendering apathy and people's reluctance to do something and produce, and on the other, is provoking a social explosion.

The question of the transition to market relations is being decided under such very complex conditions. Society does not as yet realize the full extent of the problems that will inevitably accompany this process and make it very painful for people. It has to be considered that the transition from an economy of centralized planning to a market economy will be effected on the giant scale of our country. It is with good reason that the reconstruction being ventured has already acquired the epithet "fourth Russian revolution."

Even the developers of the well-known drafts of transition to the market cannot answer—I saw this for myself at a recent meeting of the Central Committee Politburo—the specific questions as to whether the consequences of the recession, inevitable in this period, have been tallied; what payment society is to place on the altar of the market, including the kind of unemployment that is forecast; and from where in the impoverished state coffers the resources to compensate for the unemployment are to come. And this is a far from complete list of questions that arise in connection with the coming changes in the economic sphere.

It is understandable, therefore, why the mood in society is so ambivalent and why opinions differ so much. Different approaches are being manifested—from total rejection of the market and the equating of it and capitalism through euphoria, through a blind faith that the market has fabulous power and will in itself solve all problems and feed and clothe everyone and make everyone happy.

I believe that we must not go to extremes—either in a rejection of the market or in sweet dreams. Yes, the market is essential to the restructuring of our economy. It is an economic category and cannot be perceived as an attribute merely of the capitalist social and political economic system alone. Market relations have given a good account of themselves in world civilization as a mechanism of the production of sufficient social wealth. There is no other convincing alternative to impart dynamism to our economy. But the market cannot be deified in the same way that we formerly idealized the planned system. I want to emphasize that the people should be well aware what they will have to encounter and what difficulties to endure.

The party must go into the period of the establishment of market relations with its eyes open. In turning its policy toward people, it cannot tell a half-truth and skirt around problems.

A high rate of inflation, the stopping and closure of a number of enterprises, sharp income differentiation—this is a far from complete list of the "charms" of market relations.

World experience shows that problems of unemployment will intensify in line with further involvement in the market. At first the victims of unemployment will be simply those who are poor workers and those who have no professional training or trade. Then the strength of manpower at the enterprises will decline in the process of rationalization of production, increased productivity, and a reduction in socially necessary expenditure.

However much people may try to persuade us otherwise, the economic position of the population will deteriorate for all that. And the already low living standard will decline ever further. It may of course be expected that in expectation of future sufficiency people will tighten their belts. But for how long will these sacrifices be required of them? We have to think about this today.

People's consciousness, the social mentality, and the rules of relationships with us are different from those that take shape under the conditions of a private-ownership market economy. Their profound restructuring is necessary, and this will hardly happen quickly.

The market organization of production and consumption has its own rules of the game and its own style of economic thinking in which our people are untaught. Simultaneously with a restructuring of the economic system we need to conduct an all-embracing restructuring in people's minds. Only then will the market be for them an acknowledged necessity, will it be accepted, and might positive results be anticipated.

Another no less important problem is connected with what is called the "enterprise spirit." It is naive to suppose that everyone or almost everyone is capable of organizing modern production and the sale of output profitably for himself and for society and showing himself to good advantage in services. In the estimation of specialists, Western included, there are in any society just five to seven percent suited to such a role out of the total population. And enterprise culture also is directly dependent on the level of development of society and national traditions. Even in the East European countries in which, as distinct from us, the private-ownership mentality has been preserved, enterprise is developing insipidly.

At the same time only people who have completely mastered the art of enterprise will be capable of introducing new mechanisms in the economy. However, many of those who are today longing to be leaders of the domestic market have nothing in common with people of the new economic thinking. The basis of their mentality is commonplace self-seeking which is incapable of being the engine of progress.

Practical steps pertaining to the transfer of the economy to a new quality is a matter for the state and the country's government. And the party must determine its action strategy and tactics for it is, after all, changing from being a state-administrative structure into a genuinely political organization. It can no longer identify itself in its actions with the state organs of administration and be an appendage of government. It may approve and support much of what the latter does, but must retain the right to act as an opponent, upholding the interests of the social groups and strata on which it is based.

The first and most important thing is the party's political struggle to ensure the social protection of the working man in the broad understanding of this task. And fundamental significance here is attached to the question of property.

The functioning of the market should presuppose the equality of all forms of ownership, private included. This is axiomatic. It is important, however, not to go to extremes. It can be seen from the mood, which is being shaped by the media to a considerable extent, that many people are prepared to organize truly socialist competition in respect of the introduction of private property.

The question is where it is to come from? There is clearly just one source—the privatization of some state-owned property. And this step needs to be taken. That we need to consider here in whose interests the means of production will be denationalized is another matter. There is a perfectly real danger that they will come to be in the hands of those who have put together considerable sums of capital in ways that are far from legitimate.

It is estimated that one out of every 10 inhabitants of the country has difficulty living from one paycheck to the next, and that all the billions of savings book deposits are owned by just one-eighth of our citizens, given considerable discrepancies in the amounts of the deposits. And this is a property characterization, so to speak, of the bulk of the population. But as you know, the turnover of the shadow economy is many times in excess even of these figures. So within whose means will it be to redeem means of production from the state?

It is essential to conduct **public** privatization—really transfer state-owned property to those by whose labor it was created and who really have the economic and moral right to it.

The joint-stock and cooperative forms of ownership should enjoy greater development at the initial stage of transition to the market. The controlling block of shares here should be reserved for the work force in order that it feel itself to be the boss on the shop floor.

The other side of the coin is the correlation of the state sector and other forms of ownership. The dominant position of the first will increasingly become a thing of the past, but it will retain an influential position in the future also. At each stage of transition to the market, the state should ensure the optimum correlation of the state and private sectors that is appropriate to the state of affairs in the economy and does not lead to further unbalancing.

It is the state and government of the country that should assume the obligation to the people in the fulfillment of social programs oriented primarily toward retirees, the needy, invalids, large families and support of the youth. Unless this happens, these programs will peter out and that which is associated in people's minds with socialist gains and the socialist choice of the country's development will be lost.

The laws of the market are tough, and this needs to be recognized. They do not brook disorder, lax management, and technical and technological backwardness. You could vanish in their spontaneity if you are unprepared.

And objective processes of development cannot be shoved into some network. To do so would be to confuse the people. And their disappointment—if not today but on the 501st day when they became convinced of the untenability of what had been promised—would be profound.

Having therefore mapped out transition to the market as a long-term goal of economic reform, it is now important to concentrate on stabilization of the economy and creation of starting conditions.

It is necessary to stabilize the situation primarily in the interests of the continuation of perestroyka. A further deterioration in the state of affairs would play into the hands of the conservative forces which are already looking forward in anticipation to the failure of the democratic transformations. This cannot be permitted.

We are far from identifying perestroyka with today's disorder in society. It is necessary finally to separate the wheat from the chaff and determine what in our life comes from genuine perestroyka and renewal, and what from a commonplace inability to administer the complex state and economic mechanism and the habit of failing to spot real life for slogans.

The development of market relations in all its ingredients—and this means the raw material, commodity and services market, the capital market, the labor market and the currency market—is impossible without the intervention of the state and without its organizing authority. We need to rid ourselves of the dangerous myth that the unlimited freedom of the market will in itself lead to the desired results of transformation of the centralized economy. We simply do not have the time for this. We will not succeed without state protectionism. And going by the experience of such countries as the United States and Britain, the time of such "self-regulation" is calculated in centuries. At the same time however in Japan, where a market was in fact shaped in the postwar period under the influence and vigorous intervention of the state, the market required 10-15 years to reach "maturity."

The role of the state at this stage should be manifested not in verbal but effective power over the state of affairs and the accelerated creation of the corresponding infrastructure of the future market economy.

It is primarily a question of the need to bring order to bear in the country's finances, with possibly the implementation of monetary reform that does not hurt the working man but that strikes painfully at the capital of the shadow economy, the trade mafia, and the operators of the black market. Special measures, including those that the president of the country has begun to apply in the interests of the balance and saturation of the market with commodity supplies, and an effective mechanism of their realization are needed.

And is it possible to sever at a stroke all the threads of state regulation of the economy under the conditions of our multinational country where, because of historical singularities, all is so closely interrelated and interdependent? Separatism, forcibly broken internal economic relations, and artificially erected customs barriers have also become a serious cause of the overall shortages.

Of course where the fabric is thin, tears occur. Our disconnectedness stems from the decrepit political relations between the republics, and it is essential to urgently reconstruct them. The new Union treaty should do this. Without a unified state, each will not in isolation form a genuine market and would not survive in the world system of market relations.

I would like to dwell on one further aspect of the problem of transition to the market which, unless it is taken into consideration, could have a very painful effect on the development of domestic science. As you can understand, this problem is of particular significance for Moscow with its inherently high concentration of scientific potential.

Under the conditions of the complete shortage of commodities, it is highly likely that within five to seven years manufacturers will have no serious need for S&T innovations. Judge for yourselves: An industrial executive in a market economy requires new technology no sooner than a decline in the demand for products manufactured on the old equipment. A special study of the question of state support for the development of both applied and basic research is essential if we want not only not to lose the intellectual potential still available to us but also to multiply it.

Of course it is not possible at the plenum today to make an all-embracing analysis of the problems arising in connection with transition to the market. There are far more questions today than answers. And while this ratio persists, mistrust of the market will be strong also. Unfortunately the proposed programs will not dispel this mistrust either, and this is why we cannot fully support either of them. There is something else of importance also. It is impossible substituting for strategy just one goal. A structural change in industry, its accelerated modernization, and the development of S&T progress are needed.

I would like to emphasize our position once again. We are for the transfer of the economy to the principles of market relations. The critical tone of our arguments in this connection is dictated not by an endeavor to intimidate ourselves and others with the burdens of transition to the market but by a high degree of exactingness toward the government, the state authorities, and the president of the country for the balanced consideration and consistency of the adopted decisions and a readiness to ensure for the people the minimum social change for the implementation of the economic transformations.

Comrades!

We have also today to adopt a decision on the dates of the second stage of the 28th city party conference and to discuss the proposals pertaining to its agenda.

With regard to the need for careful preparation of the documents and material and work on the nomination in the party organizations of candidates for the gorkom and the party organization control commission, the Moscow Gorkom Bureau proposes that the second stage of the conference begin on 29 November.

The main document to be adopted is the "Action Program." The draft is now being drawn up. Following discussion in the gorkom commissions, it will be published in order that the city's Communists and Muscovites may have their say. And with regard to this extensive discussion and the exchange of opinions at the second stage of the conference, its adoption has been proposed as the immediate reference point of our work.

I would like to call your attention to key points in the approaches to the formation of the program, which are based on an understanding of the fundamentally new role of the party in the political structure of our society. The CPSU should be a party of social progress and the social protection of the working people and a party of humanism and civil concord.

In the opinion of the gorkom bureau, the action program should be based on the "Position of the Moscow City Party Organization for the 28th CPSU Congress." At the same time it should be a document of a fundamentally different nature and resemble largely a plan of work insofar as it is necessary to bring together specific steps in various fields of activity.

Of course it cannot be complete and encompass the whole diversity of the activity of the city's Communist organization. But first, this is not the task that is set for the draft document. It would evidently be expedient to concentrate attention on that which is basic and most important in work. Second, it will be open to creative development and amplification by proposals that the city's Communists deem it necessary to insert. And third, much should be engendered daily by life itself directly in the primary party organizations. Tis cannot be inscribed in a single program.

What is contemplated in the sphere of providing for the social protection of the working people? It is essential to highlight this field of activity inasmuch as particular significance is attached to it for the party under the conditions of the market. This is a question of the party's ties to the masses and its social base.

The action program will contain primarily defense of the integrity of the work force, which caters for the vital activity of the city itself. The economic disorders cannot be permitted to jeopardize the development of the municipal infrastructure, as has already happened with the construction of the metro for example.

I visited Moscow's metro construction workers yesterday. A strong outfit constituting the pride of working Moscow is literally on the verge of disintegration. The reason is that the question of who will finance construction of the metro in the city—the Union or republic government and Moscow City Soviet—has not been decided. The outfit understands full well that without development of the "Moscow underground" the city will snarl up in a transport problem. It will struggle, therefore, and was even prepared to call a warning strike.

It has not come to this apparently. Literally yesterday the Union Government adopted a decision on financing metro construction for the next year. The main question has been settled, but other problems of the metro construction workers remain. And we are on their side. The working people's just struggle will continue to enjoy the support of the gorkom.

It is impossible in the "Action Program" not to take account of the multitude of problems that the population will inevitably encounter in the employment field. Undoubtedly, concern for the fate of people who find themselves out of a job should be assumed by the state and the government. But foreseeing that they could prove incapable of coping with the avalanche-like nature of the growth of unemployment, it is proposed channeling resources and organizational efforts into the creation under our aegis of training and tuition courses and schools for modern production and management personnel. These could be marketing schools, courses for tuition in working with computer equipment, and others.

It would be the right thing were our party organization to participate in various employment insurance funds. As you know, the Moscow Gorkom is already the cofounder of a fund for assistance to the unemployed, the initiative for whose creation came from the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. I would note that this is not a new sphere of activity for us, incidentally. The gorkom transferred resources to the fund for assisting the casualties of the earthquake in Armenia and the fund for victims of the Chernobyl accident and traditionally participates in the Children's Fund. The Moscow Gorkom was, incidentally, a sponsor of the creation of the All-Union Children's Park and contemplates participating in other projects of social significance for the city also.

This will naturally require considerable resources and will in the future require even more. It is necessary in this connection, under the conditions of the reduction in the receipts of membership dues and the sharply reduced proceeds from the publication of newspapers, to think about additional possibilities for financing charitable programs in order to support both materially and morally the most vulnerable strata of the townspeople—retirees, invalids, large families, and the youth.

The gorkom has already begun an undertaking to assist children's establishments and homes for the elderly. A first consignment of color television receivers has been handed over to a number of them. I believe that all those here present will support this venture.

Active use should be made of participation in the soviets the right of legislative initiative [sentence as published]. Considering Moscow's specifics and its higher cost of living, it would be expedient to sponsor an initiative concerning determination of a subsistence level for Muscovites and the allocation from the municipal budget of the necessary resources to support those who are below the poverty line.

The city's youth is also today in need of legislative protection. The proposal concerning the presentation of an initiative concerning the assurance of social safeguards for the younger generation under the conditions of transition to the market will be submitted for this reason. The city should undertake the long-term extension of credit to young people for the purpose of allowing them to improve themselves, work, create and support a family.

The possibilities of the city's party organization should be used for all-around support of the consumer societies, primarily for the exercise of nongovernmental supervision of pricing and the quality of goods and services, in the struggle against monopolism in production and services leading to price diktat.

I foresee there being many skeptics who will doubt the need for a political party for much of what is being outlined. They will say that this is the business of the trade unions and youth and women's organizations. Some things might not stand the test of time, possibly, and will not take root in our practice. But I would like us to be in no hurry to brush aside any practical undertaking that could prove useful for people and produce visible results. There can ultimately be no trifling matters and secondary concerns for a serious political party. The more so when it is a question of so complex a social and political situation. It is for this reason that we propose the inclusion in the "Action Program" of such nonpolitical undertakings as assistance to young mothers, the staging of charity fairs and lotteries, and the organization of unpaid environmental Saturday work days and volunteer work on the restoration of cultural monuments and city planning.

The "Action Program" should undoubtedly also reflect our approach to the party's contemporary ideological work. This applies primarily to the mass media. We plan to organize the publication of a children's newspaper and to publish a weekly for women as a supplement to MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, and to continue to assist the rayon and works newspapers with both paper and printing facilities. Studies for the creation of a Moscow party news agency are being conducted. We will make more active use of television air time.

Together with enterprise and establishment party committees the gorkom is working on converting the political education labs into social and political centers. I believe that the party committees are doing the right thing by preserving as part of their structure individual permanent heads of social and political information centers and displaying concern for the personnel essential to the party in the organization of day-to-day political work in the masses.

Considering the growing role of the public formations—including those that are being newly created—in the satisfaction of people's interests, the gorkom is actively seeking contacts for cooperation with all that are constructive in their program of activity and operate from standpoints of civil concord. There are already examples of common work for the good of Muscovites with Moscow national-cultural societies, the "Blue Movement," the Association of Social Science Lecturers, and many others. Plans for the development of further cooperation with broad-based public forces of the city should also, evidently, be reflected in the "Action Program."

Determining the priorities of our activity for the coming period, we propose to include a number of specific steps for the protection of mass sports and in the cultural sphere against the tax squeeze. Against the background of the commercialization of sport and culture the city's party organizations could begin the development of their own system of free or accessible sports and cultural establishments that would be maintained by the Communists on a volunteer basis.

The "Action Program" cannot fail to contain specific questions of intraparty life. The main thing is to determine the main directions and forms of the activity of the primary party organizations under the new conditions. It is important that this be approached not as an end in itself but as a means of the party's democratization via an enhancement of the role of its main components and the party masses. It is this line that was supported by the 28th CPSU Congress.

The "Action Program" is a document being worked on in the conference's delegates' club, whose activity has been virtually unceasing. On the delegates' table are also the draft resolutions:

Report of the Moscow Gorkom and the Auditing Commission of the Moscow City Party Organization;
Property and Financial Activity of the City Party Organization;
Work With the Youth;
The Party and the Soviets of People's Deputies.

A thorough analysis of the economic and financial activity of the city party organization is being performed. The delegates have been supplied with all the accounting documents necessary for verification and study.

Proposals in respect to the structure and manning level of the Moscow Gorkom and its apparatus, draft regulations governing the control commission of the Moscow city party organization of the CPSU, the standing orders of the conference and the composition of its working bodies, and proposals pertaining to the formation of the elective bodies are being prepared also.

It is proposed that the gorkom be elected on the basis of a combination of two principles—the quota principle and the direct nomination of candidates at the conference itself. This will make it possible to take account of the interests and ensure the representation of the rayon party organizations and various groups of Communists and currents in the CPSU.

It would be expedient to form within the gorkom four standing commissions: organizational-party and ideological work, problems of socioeconomic development, and relations with state and social and political structures and mass movements. Appropriate subdivisions of the apparatus will be directly subordinate to the commissions.

Evidently it would be justified were the apparatus of the gorkom commissions to consist of working groups, including problem-solving and special-purpose groups for specific areas of work incorporating experts and consultants.

We propose the formation of a press center as well as a legal group whose creation is brought about by the need for legal support for the legislative and economic initiatives of the gorkom and raykoms.

It would seem important to precisely determine the principles of formation of the party apparatus—on a democratic, competitive basis per a recommendation of the primary party organizations from the ranks of Communists with high political, professional and moral qualities.

The enlistment on a contract basis of highly skilled specialists is envisaged for in-depth expert-consultative work.

Transition to the proposed structure will make it possible to reduce the apparatus of the Moscow Gorkom up to 50 percent. We believe that transformation of the apparatus cannot be delayed. We need to embark on this work prior to the second stage of the conference even.

Comrades!

As you know, a report and election campaign is under way at this time in the city's party organizations. Although we do not want to hurry it, we cannot be satisfied with its progress. Meetings and conferences have been held in only 10 percent of the organizations. And everything is being dragged out on account of some expectations of new instructions from above, whereas it is necessary to take shape organizationally and to operate actively as quickly as possible.

After the conference has been held and the report and election campaign completed, our city party organization must change to a qualitatively new condition. The priority of arguments and debate must give way to the priority of specific practical business. Of course, complete like-mindedness in the spirit of the times of stagnation is not intended. Various viewpoints will be manifested and diverse opinions expressed, and the Communists will occupy positions in keeping with their convictions which will only help the party's cause. But the city party organization must have a platform common for all—a platform of practical work. The city's Communists will be able to unite on this basis.

Healthy debate in the party's ranks, which is essential for its vital activity, must not supplant the constructive principle in its activity and assume exaggerated proportions. Pedantic arguments about the fact of the formation of the Communist Party of Russia and arguments about whether to join it or not cannot be permitted to continue to overwhelm us and put blinders on us.

Unfortunately this is being encountered in the course of the report and election campaign in a number of party organizations. Reflection on this subject is necessary, but it must not become an idee fixe with great potential destructive power.

I would like once again to express fundamental considerations on this score. Our constructive position in respect to the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] is well known and was heard on the rostrum of the constituent congress. We are for the unity of Russia's Communists and support their territorial association in a republic organization. But what is needed is a party capable not of lagging behind reality but being a step ahead of life and responding to its democratic aspirations. What is needed is not a new party of apparatus officialdom but a party of working people.

Under conditions where the active polarization of parties and movements is occurring and the political center is being stretched thin, the consolidation of all the healthy forces of society is needed more than ever. In our opinion, the CPSU can and should perform a pronounced role in the shaping of a bloc of forces advocating the surmounting in the country of the chaos, disintegration and separation of the peoples, and the achievement of civil peace.

We are all members of one party—the CPSU. And we must for the sake of social concord overcome our own antagonisms and get rid of egocentric sentiments.

The role of the leaders of the party and their personal authority and close ties to the party masses are greater than ever here. Better knowledgeability about all that is happening in the party's central authorities is needed. It would not be a bad thing and we believe would only help the cause were the secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee and the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee to register without delay with party organizations. Many Moscow party organizations would be prepared to register them today even, I believe.

The contradictory processes occurring in society cannot, undoubtedly, fail to be reflected in the state of the party ranks. There has been a marked increase in resignations from the CPSU in recent months. Some 90,000 persons have surrendered their party cards in Moscow in just nine months, and what is more half of them in the last two months.

There have been various reasons for this. Those who in terms of inner conviction broke with the party long ago but who remained in it from opportunist considerations are resigning, as are also those who believe that on account of their age and the state of their health they can be of no further use. There are those who are succumbing to an emotional frame of mind. But unfortunately there are among them also real people, devoted to the party cause, whose resignation from the CPSU is taken particularly painfully.

Yes, in accordance with the new rules this matter is purely voluntary. But we cannot be a party of the indifferent. The party organizations should not be indifferent to the motives prompting people's conduct; we need to be able to understand them and help them make sense of themselves and surrounding reality.

A particular word about replenishment of the CPSU. I am sure that at this extraordinarily difficult time for us it is necessary to display genuinely civic courage to openly call oneself a Communist. This evokes respect.

We have invited to the plenum today a group of our young party comrades. We will in the very near future be conducting an all-Moscow meeting of young Communists. More than 8,000 Muscovites have joined the party this year.

As long as the process of replenishment and renewal of our ranks—and consequently an influx of new ideas, initiatives, and energy is under way—the party itself will live also.

Comrades!

In a month we will be commemorating the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

A stream of letters from Muscovites, and not only inhabitants of our city, caused by the well-known appeal of the chairmen of the soviets of Moscow and Leningrad against commemoration of the October anniversary, and for preparation for the winter, is being received in the gorkom and the editorial offices of Moscow newspapers. We are rightly being criticized by the Communists and nonparty people for having failed to respond at once to this statement. Without making excuses, I will say that we wanted the people to have their say first. Now we see that there is to be a holiday!

There is among the townspeople support for the following proposals: holding a ceremonial meeting on October eve, staging the parade in Red Square on 7 November, and staging a demonstration the same day.

We believe that any excessive organization needs to be avoided. No vouchers for participation in the holiday festivities. Only the command of the heart should bring people into the columns of demonstrators, although we know that there will also be many people prepared to spoil the holiday and Muscovites' mood and daub with a thick black paint all that remains that is bright and good in people's hearts.

Let them seethe with malice and hatred.

We will go to the October demonstration with slogans in support of perestroyka, the socialist choice, and civil peace, advocating the assertion of the priority of values common to all mankind and a sure future for our children.

Resolution Outlining Tasks Passed

91UN0083A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 p 2

[Resolution adopted at 5 October Moscow Gorkom plenum]

[Text] A Moscow Gorkom [City Party Committee] plenum has discussed the state of affairs in the country and in the city and expresses serious concern at the political and socioeconomic situation that has taken shape.

Crisis phenomena are growing constantly, inflation and commodity shortages are increasing, and labor conflicts and wildcat strikes are growing. Discipline on the job and the prestige of socially useful labor are declining. Narrow-minded pragmatism, egotism, crime, and profiteering are becoming increasingly prevalent.

Interregional economic ties are being severed, and the economy is sliding increasingly rapidly toward forms of exchange in kind. In the current year the enterprises of the city have failed to meet contracted obligations to the extent of more than 130 million rubles. Food supplies are causing particular concern. The city is being rocked by "bread," "tobacco," and other crises one after another. The harvest that has been cultivated is perishing, and the vegetables have not been laid in. The work of many municipal services is paralyzed. Fulfillment of the plan for the construction of apartment houses and facilities of the social sphere has been disrupted. There are appreciable oversights in the preparation of the city for winter.

The disintegration of the economy is exacerbating the political tension.

Strategic miscalculations and tactical errors made in the process of perestroyka have led to this.

It is under such conditions that the transition to market relations is being prepared.

The Moscow Gorkom believes that the transition to market relations in the economy is today a reality. What is astonishing, however, is that the program of transition to the market is being adopted in haste and without the participation of the working people. In a society persistently moving toward a state based on the rule of law, the people have found themselves distanced from a choice affecting each person and the future arrangement of the Soviet country. But they should know what they will be having to confront, particularly in the transition period, and the kind of difficulties they will have to endure.

The absence of a clear-cut policy on the part of the CPSU Central Committee in respect of a program of transition to the market is exerting a negative influence on the social and political situation and the authority of the party organizations. This is intensifying the state of uncertainty and the disconnection of the Communists and all working people, and contributing to political confrontation.

At so critical a time, the CPSU Central Committee plenum to be held this October must formulate the party's precise and unambivalent position in respect of paths of transition to the market.

The participants in the Moscow Gorkom plenum are hoping for decisive actions from the president of the USSR pertaining to a stabilization of the situation in the interests of perestroyka and the realization of economic reform in the country.

Under the conditions of the multiparty system that is taking shape, the Moscow Gorkom plenum expects that in the present situation other political parties and movements will express their position in respect of the country's transition to market relations.

The Moscow Gorkom proposes the following priority measures pertaining to the actions of the party organizations in the process of transition to the market.

First, we believe that the transition to the market should be preceded by the effective stabilization of the economy and the creation of normal conditions for the work of the state-run enterprises. It is the duty of Moscow's Communists to support the working people by practical work on the creation of additional jobs, employment insurance funds, and systems for the retraining of people released in the process of reorganizing management of the economy and developing market relations.

Second, we advocate the transfer without compensation of part of state property to the work force, that is to those by whose labor it was created and who have the economic and moral right to it.

Third, the Moscow city party organization will make active use of the possibilities of its representation in the soviets of all levels for the adoption of decisions on the allocation from the budget of resources for the material support of the needy strata and the assurance of social safeguards for the younger generation, the youth, retirees, invalids, large families, and other most vulnerable groups of the population. The city party organization supports the activity of the consumer societies pertaining to the monitoring of prices and the quality of goods and services and in the struggle against monopolism in production and services.

We call on Communists who are managers of Moscow enterprises and organizations to make every effort toward the unconditional fulfillment of the supplies plan for the fourth quarter; ensure the conclusion of contracts for 1991; and render real assistance to the city's public utilities, children's establishments, and hospitals in the preparation for winter. We consider it the duty of each Communist to participate personally in work to save the harvest in the fields of the Moscow area.

The Moscow Gorkom proposes that the various political forces adopt concerted actions for a solution of the crisis socioeconomic problems of the city of Moscow.

Broken Contracts Aggravate Leningrad Food Problems

PM2210153690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent L. Kirillova under the rubric "Strong Warning": "The Partner Has Not Kept His Word"]

[Text] Leningrad—The heads of Leningrad's food departments have traveled all over, from Brest to the Urals, in search of truck garden products. It is less than a month before the date for the completion of vegetable procurement. The half-empty stores give an idea of how it is going. One wonders what lies in store for customers when this poor season has also passed.

One can already get an idea of the harvest results. It is clear that thousands of tonnes of potatoes will have to be omitted from delivery plans. This is largely due to the torrential rain which swamped the fields. And if the weather is at fault, then there are other reasons for harvest losses which can be blamed on the city dwellers whose help arrived very late, the chaotic organization at local level, and of course the inadequate equipment available to the farmers. In this situation one has to rely on "outside" suppliers.

However, the situation today is such that a new system based on the market economy has swept in hard on the heels of the old management system in order to replace it. But it should not be forgotten that the market means that one has obligations. In fact, many partners are trying to act entirely in their own interests and are ignoring contract commitments. For instance, some oblasts in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], Belorussia, the Ukraine, and other republics are stating new terms, increased prices, and barter deals despite having already concluded contracts. For example, Voronezh is not only asking twice as much as the contract states for potatoes, but is still demanding the sale of steel pipes, "Volga" cars, and consumer goods into the bargain. And Lipetsk wants Leningrad footwear which, incidentally, Leningraders rarely see themselves.

Recently, as a result of a decision by the Leningrad Soviet, subsidies have increased and it is now possible to buy potatoes, cabbages, and beet at the higher purchase prices.

It is true that in the Ukraine and in Moldavia they are prepared to sell potatoes at contract prices, but higher instances are interfering in the commitments that have been made with kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Now a special resolution by the republics' Councils of Ministers is needed for potato supplies.

Leningrad Communist Press Distribution Criticized

PM2310105190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent V. Gerasimov under the rubric "Keen View": "Unwelcome Newspapers"]

[Text] Leningrad—"Not a kopek for the newspapers PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA!"—this hand-written poster is stuck on the inside of the window of the "Leningrad People's Front" kiosk near the "Akademicheskaya" subway station. Beneath the appeal is a calculation of the money in someone else's pocket: How much the CPSU has received in membership dues and what party publications have given it.

Of course, the kiosk does not sell the communist press. Here there are only newspapers and brochures of a particular bent: "The Lone General" [Odinokiy General] about Oleg Kalugin, LENINGRADSKIY LITERATOR, ESDEK.... The efficient saleswoman was persistently touting her wares, although I would not claim that customers were taking them eagerly. They would sometimes leaf through them with curiosity and return them to the little window. It looks as though people have already grown cool toward the sensational but unreasoned revelations of which the newly emerged press is so full—they are more concerned with other needs. Only active, and I would say importunate advertizing, helps to sell the stale goods.

One can understand the perplexity of many PRAVDA readers and subscribers who telephone the correspondents' center during the subscription campaign. But where, they ask, are the Communists who act as their press' propaganda workers? Why can their voices not be heard? After all in a number of rayons it has become impossible not only to subscribe to but even to buy a newspaper....

I myself have been convinced of this. The "Soyuzpechat" kiosk is situated opposite the "Leningrad People's Front" trading point. The window is closed with a board reading "Closed until 1600 hours" and the counter is of sterile cleanliness. Outside the "Politekhnicheskiy institut" station the picture is the same: The kiosks are empty, there are no central or local newspapers.

"You understand, today it is very difficult to agitate for the party press," they complained at the party oblast committee. "The price is high, the subjects covered do not suit many readers. How can we counter newspapers of a different orientation: They contain anecdotes and scandal. In general it seems that there is no topic which can be out of bounds for these publications...."

After this talk there arose, but remained open, the question: But have attempts at least been made? Facts are obstinate things. In the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks I did not manage to buy a single one of the newspapers against which the "People's Front" is agitating. But the Vyborgskiy party rayon committee, on whose territory both subway stations are situated, at the height of the subscription to newspapers and journals did not manage to gather together even once the public distributors to brief them on tactics. Is the result that even in some party committees communist newspapers are also becoming unwelcome?

Leningrad Soviet Attempt To Curb Media Protested

PM2310102390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by N. Volynskiy under the "Astonishing" rubric: "Blow to the Press"]

[Text] Leningrad—This news sent many Leningrad journalists into a state of semi-shock, both people who hold radical positions and people who categorize themselves as centrists or moderate conservatives.... The point is that a Leningrad City Soviet session adopted a document reflecting an attempt to curb the local press and prohibit journalists of all persuasions from having opinions of their own on the work of the people's elected representatives.

So what is going on? The country's most democratic soviet of people's deputies, as it likes to advertise itself, has suddenly launched a head-on attack on democracy. The newspapers LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA and SMENA as well as Leningrad Television broadcasts—particularly "600 Seconds"—have essentially been declared enemies of the Leningrad City Soviet, and overt hints have also been dropped about "Fifth Wheel."

All this is truly astonishing. Indeed, who was it who was particularly active in denigrating the old authorities in the city? SMENA, "600 Seconds," and "Fifth Wheel." Who molded public opinion and thereby brought the present corps of deputies to power? The lion's share of the credit belongs to these same media. But now the lovingly raised and now strong "offspring" has taken a club to the heads of its "parents."

The accusations are substantial: "campaign to discredit the soviets," "demeaning criticism," "stirring up passions," "encroaching on deputies' honor and dignity," and other similar strong expressions. Like it or not, unless your nerves are very strong then work out the implications for yourself: Do not criticize the servants of the people or you will get it in the neck!

The Leningrad City Soviet's action was bound to cause a counterreaction. On 18 October the inhabitants of the northwestern region of the country saw an astonishing picture on their television screens. Sitting around the same table in the studio were Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting Chairman Boris Petrov, who is described as a centrist; "600 Seconds" commentator Aleksandr Nevzorov, an "independent" monarchist; and "Fifth Wheel" Chief Editor Bella Kurkova, a radical democrat. They unanimously expressed their indignation at the Leningrad City Soviet document and stated the need to be independent of the local and central authorities. SMENA also rejected the accusations.

If there is one main thing of value that has been won in the course of perestroyka it is freedom of speech. This is an absolute value transcending political interests and indifferent to "right" or "left." Especially when it comes to society's benefit, the people's benefit. And so journalists with differing views and from differing parties must unite to ensure that the era of the gag does not return.

Irkutsk Holds Russia Federation Party Conference

LD2210181790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] A founding conference of the oblast branch of the Democratic Party of the Russian Federation has taken place in Irkutsk. Those taking part have discussed its role according to its charter and manifesto, elected the board of the Irkutsk branch, the Control and Finance Commission, and delegates to an all-Russian congress of the Democratic Party.

Mari Autonomous Republic Declares Sovereignty

LD2210182390 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Yoshkar Ola October 22 TASS—The parliament of the Mari Autonomous Republic, which is located between the rivers Volga and Vyatka in Russia, proclaimed the republic's sovereignty at a special session today.

The newly proclaimed Republic of Mari El (Mari Land) will remain part of the Russian Republic, the largest in the Soviet Union, but the lands, natural riches and waters on its territory will be the exclusive property of the local people.

According to the declaration of state sovereignty, the three official languages will include Lowland Mari, Highland Mari and Russian, but the languages of other ethnic groups will also be preserved and developed.

Western Republics

Kebich Discusses Transfer to Market Economy

LD2210202690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, by correspondent Aleksey Zhuk; date and place not given—recorded]

[Summary] "As you know, regarding the stabilization of the national economy and the transition to a market economy, a broad field of activity is envisaged for the Union republics which are to work out their own specific laws to implement the transition to market relations. At the extraordinary session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, one of these issues was discussed—the transition to a market economy. Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, talked about the details of this transition in Belorussia. Our correspondent Aleksey Zhuk spoke to him."

Kebich says that the Belorussian economy was once highly praised. Now, in relation to last year, unspecified economic rates have decreased by from 50 to 66 percent against those planned. This gives rise for concern. The question of which plan is to be used as a blueprint for a transition to a market economy is more the priority of the planners. We have tried to get away from personalities and have assembled experts to assess the situation to work out our own program.

Kebich asks how a progam worked out for the whole Soviet Union can be applied to Belorussia where the situation is totally different from other parts of the union? He says: Industry occupies 30 percent of Belorussian industrial potential, almost all of which is mechanical engineering which requires a lot of metal, oil, and gas. Prices for raw materials are increasing by 250 percent, but finished product prices are rising by 30 percent, bankrupting the Belorussian republic. We would find ourselves in a very onerous position if we followed Gorbachev's, Yeltsin's, Shatalin's, or the government plan. Therefore we are adapting the compromise plan to our own conditions.

Zhuk says that Belorussian deputies have voted to basically adopt the program from 1 November. Kebich agrees that this is a very tight timetable.

Kebich says: "I am for the operation of a single credit and finance system. I am for the operation of a single ruble. But when we see that everything is disintegrating in front of our eyes—that despite the fact decisions have just been made on maintaining uniform prices a number of republics are adopting their own decisions—then of course we have no option but to adopt our own protective measures."

Kebich adds: "After all, the Belorussian Republic does not have a large area or a lot of space. If today meat costs 10 rubles in Estonia and sausage is even more expensive, then naturally any Estonian inhabiant who has this same Soviet ruble which today is valid on the whole territory of the Soviet Union will come and buy meat, sausage, and other goods in Belorussia. He will fully cover his transport expenses and the cost of gas, so a legal act would be additional support for us to take appropriate measures which it is necessary to adopt to protect our market economy. I think that those who read the press will get information on what sort of measures these will be in general. In any case, I can just say that they will be harsh."

Zhuk asks: "Vyacheslav Frantsevich, will Belorussia have its own customs and checkpoints some time in the near future?"

Kebich replies: "Even the most elementary calculation on how much expense we will have to incur to have complete customs services and close the whole flow today shows that it is incredible. Let us leave the plane of debate for the plane of realities. I think that those laws which will be enforced will pre-empt others. Suffice it to say that if you let five or seven people get through and export those goods which they have no right to, and if one person has his goods and transport confiscated, and if in addition the threat of the criminal code hangs over him—right up to imprisonment—I think that everyone will come to their senses and will finally realise that first we must live and not think out how to avoid those punishments and other measures which we can apply to them."

Kebich ends by saying that the economic laws must be prepared before the next routine session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet which is convening at the end of November.

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Debates Economic Reform

PM2310134690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Mikhail Shimanskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Belorussia's Route to the Market"]

[Text] Minsk—Discussion of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] economic reform program at the republic Supreme Soviet session has been keen.

Heated discussion went on for five days. Finally, the legislature passed a resolution approving the basic provisions of the program and proposals of the republic government on the transition to a market economy from 1 November 1990. But before such a decision was taken Council of Ministers Chairman V. Kebich, who delivered the report, had to mount the session rostrum several times and come under "crossfire," so numerous and uncompromising were the questions from people's deputies. The premier must be given his due—he answered all questions in an informed and professional manner without cutting any corners.

It was resolved that standing commissions would continue working on the program together with parliament. This work lasted two and a half days.

The most heated debates revolved around two issues—attitudes to the Union treaty and private ownership. The majority of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet commissions advocated retaining the economic union of sovereign states. All the commissions except one recognize the possibility of various kinds of ownership existing, including private ownership, but only three commissions admit the private ownership of land with right of redemption [s pravom vykupa].

The basic principles of the concept of Belorussia's transition to a market economy emerged after refinement in the commissions and government. These are first and foremost the state sovereignty of the republic, the supremacy of republic laws, its own credit and budgetary system, and autonomy in determining the procedure for paying fixed payments into the union budget from the republic budget or via a federal tax system. The transition to the market has more than just socioeconomic consequences. It attracts within its orbit, as V. Kebich stressed, virtually all our public institutions, politics, morality, psychology, and culture.

Deputy Z. Poznyak, leader of the Belorussian People's Front, asked to be given the floor in order to deliver a supplementary report on behalf of the parliamentary opposition. He stated that the opposition has its own standpoint, distinct from that of the government, on the program for the transition to a market economy.

The republic will find it extremely tough to go this difficult route alone. The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet has therefore proposed to republic Supreme Soviets that an interrepublic commission be set up to draft uniform rules of conduct within the bounds of their common economic space.

Snegur Appeals to Gagauz To Prevent 'Tragedy'

LD2210153390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1434 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS, MOLDOVA-PRESS correspondents Anatoliy Gof and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 22 Oct (TASS and MODOVA-PRES)—Mircha Ion Snegur, president of the Moldova [Moldavia] Soviet Socialist Republic, has appealed to the Gagauz who live in the south of the republic. His message says that "the aggravation of the sociopolitical situation in the Republic has reached a crisis point. This has been brought about to a large extent by the formation in an unconstitutional way of the so-called Gagauz and Dnestr republics. This fact means nothing other than dismemberment of the Republic and of its present territorial boundaries."

The document notes that elections to the legislative bodies of these regions have caused immense psychological tension and have led to the brink of civil war. The majority of the republic's population are thoroughly anxious about its territorial integrity. If the elections to a supreme soviet of the so-called Gagauz republic planned for 28 October are not abandoned, the situation could get out of control.

"As president, I would be obliged to use every precautionary power under the law to prevent a tragedy and the preserve the territorial integrity of the republic," the message says.

However, in the president's opinion the Gagauz should demand of the leaders who have taken them down a dead-end that they suspend the unconstitutional election campaign, resume the constructive dialogue with the specially formed commission of deputies of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and continue the search for peaceful ways to resolve the problems of the Gagauz ethnic group.

The problem of staging the elections planned for 28 October in the south of Moldova and for 25 November in the regions near the Dnestr was also discussed at a session of the council of the People's Front. It was noted that if separatist elements do not abandon these unconstitutional actions, the People's Front will be compelled to take steps to prevent these elections being held. As a first step, this biggest of the public movements addressed a call to the inhabitants of Moldova to organize into detachments of volunteers who will take part in peaceful action on 27th-28 October to block the elections to the supreme soviet of the so-called Gagauz republic.

Moldavian Officials Discuss Situation in Republic

LD2210225990 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev recently addressed a message to the leadership and people of the troubled republic of Moldova [Moldavia], the south west of this country. It urged the leadership of the republic and the leaders of its breakaway areas to start a dialogue and find mutually acceptable ways of resolving their differences.

Our reporter, Leonid Zhukov, recently back from that part of the country has these details:

The ethnic minorities in the republic are offended by the law on the official language adopted by the Moldavian parliament and the efforts by some official bodies to expedite its implementation. The Turkic speaking population in the south have declared a Gagauz republic and the Russian and Ukrainian speaking population in the area on the left bank of the Dnestr have declared a Moldavian Dnestr republic.

The call from several organizations including the Moldavian Popular Front to oppose the separatists follow the meetings the president of the republic, Mircha Snegur, had earlier this month with representatives of these organizations. He was the first to say that the extremists in the Moldavian Dnestr republic and Gagauz republic would be charged with criminal offenses.

For a comment on this I turned to Ivan Kostash who heads the Interior Ministry of the Republic of Moldova:

[Kostash in vernacular, fading into English translation] In my view, the people who are leading the process of establishing illegal state structures in the south of the republic and in the Dnestr left bank area deserve not simply to be censured but to be charged with criminal offenses. Their activities, aimed at splitting the republic, are actually an attempt to overthrow its elected government. This move may be classified as a coup attempt, if you want me to call things by their real names.

And so you see, developments in the republic of Moldova are taking on a dramatic form, what with elections to be held later this week in the proclaimed Moldavian Dnestr Republic and the Gagauz Republic. The first round of talks this month between Moldavian deputies and deputies elected to the parliament of the republic from the breakaway areas produced no result. The second round is to be held this week. As for the leadership of the republics, the president of Moldova has indicated that economic sanctions may be invoked.

Here is what President Mircha Snegur told me about the reasons for such drastic actions:

[Snegur in vernacular, fading into English translation] We don't have to finance the election for these illegal structures, do we? Once elections are held we will have to reconsider our policies, economic included, towards these areas. I'm not an advocate of tough measures, but if our voice is unheeded and if a peaceful solution to the problem is rejected, we'll not hesitate to enforce economic sanctions and an economic blockade of the so-called Moldavian Dnestr and Gagauz republics.

But the threat of a possible economic blockade seems to have had little effect on the leadership in the troubled areas, nor are they overly upset by the prospect of not being recognised by the central government in Moscow. Here is what (?Igor Smirnov) who heads the interim Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Republic told me:

[(Smirnov) in vernacular, fading into English translation] Whether we are recognized by the central government or not does not change anything. We will be recognized economically by the republics and that is the only thing that matters in the circumstances. At present, we are negotiating with some of the republics on establishing economic cooperation. We have sent envoys to the Baltic and Central Asian republics and to the Russian Federation. As for an economic blockade by the Moldavian government, well, I don't think this will require any return measures on our part.

What worsens the situation however are calls to set up units to fight extremists. As far as I know, enlistment in such units has long been underway, although both the government of the republic and the popular front deny any involvement in it. As for the Interior Ministry, here is a comment by Ivan Kostash:

[Kostash in vernacular, fading into English translation] I have no exact information on that point as an official person, but I know from various sources that such units are being formed. However, the Ministry of the Interior has nothing to do with it. Our stand is that all such activity should be carried out on a legal basis, otherwise the consequences may be unpredictable.

As for the feeling of the so-called extremists in the breakaway areas, I doubt whether they are giving the matter a second thought. I asked (?Igor Smirnov) about this:

[(Smirnov) in vernacular, fading into English translation] We do not need to be defended. We are capable of defending ourselves and we want the Moldavian leadership to finally realise this. They are free to do anything they want to, bearing in mind that we have more than 40,000 military men.

In this context, I would say that any further aggravation of the situation could well result in a civil war. The time has come for prudence on all sides.

Dnestr, Gagauz Republic Election Dates Set

PM2310133690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Statement by Leaders of Dnestr and Gagauz Republics"]

[Text] As reported by your INTERFAX correspondent from Tiraspol, a joint statement has been adopted by the Provisional Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Provisional Committee of the Gagauz Republic in connection with the elections to those republics' supreme organs of power planned for 28 and 25 November 1990. It notes that cases of threats against and pressure upon those republics from the leadership of the SSR of Moldova [Moldavia] have become more frequent. Despite this, the document says, the elections in the Dnestr area and in the south will be held as scheduled. The leadership of the Dnestr and Gagauz republics has requested that the country's Supreme Soviet send USSR people's deputies as election observers.

Lvov 7 Nov Celebrations To Be Played Down

PM2310140590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by S. Romanyuk: "Marchers Pay"]

[Text] There will be a military parade in Lvov 7 November, but it will take place on one of the outlying streets of the city adjacent to Carpathian Military District headquarters. And all the costs of organizing the event are to be borne by the military. At the same time these November days will no longer be marked in red on the Lvov political calendar. Instead 1 November—the annivesary of the proclamation of the West Ukrainian People's Republic—has been declared a holiday.

The Lvov City Soviet Presidium has urged civic calm among the population and has recommended to all organizations and institutioons that the October revolution be celebrated at work.

Kharkov Soviet Deems 7 Nov Event 'Inadvisable'

PM2310135390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by A. Kleva under the "7 November Celebrations" rubric: "Kharkov"]

[Text] The Kharkov City Soviet Presidium has virtually declared nonparticipation in the October festivities.

A decision published with considerable delay in the local press mentions that anybody who wishes to participate in a demonstration on that day must submit an application before 26 October. It also states that "the Presidium considers its inadvisable for the city soviet of people's deputies and its organs to participate in events being conducted by social organizations in connection with the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

Fifteen minutes will be allocated for laying wreaths at both the Lenin monument on Dzerzhinskiy Square and the monument to fighters for Soviet power in the Eternal Flame Gardens. It has to be noted that they are more than a kilometer apart.

It is suggested that labor collective councils supervise spending on festive decorations.

Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty Negotiations

90UN2844A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 11 Sep 90 pp 1-2

[Unattributed report on interview with L.M. Kravchuk for Ukrainian television; place and date not given: "New Contours of the Union Treaty"]

[Text] [Correspondent] Leonid Makarovich, the media have reported that there was a joint meeting in Moscow of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation in which you also participated. Unfortunately, the material of this meeting has not yet been presented extensively in the newspapers. I would therefore like to hear your opinion, from a primary source so to speak, on what kind of meeting was this and what is its significance?

[Kravchuk] You aare right, Nikolay Dmitriyevich, in observing that the media have not as yet reported this meeting except on a general level.

I would like to emphasize that both the central and republic papers and radio and television have of late been providing more or less full information about how the preparation of the program of transition to the market economy, at its concluding stage particularly, has been going. An animated discussion of problems connected with the Union treaty is under way also. This is why, when the preparation of these important and without exaggeration fateful documents entered the decisive stage, the need arose for a joint meeting of the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council to sum up what had been done and open the way for further work. This was an exceptionally important and broad-based meeting. The discussion was comprehensive, candid, and at times very sharp and uncompromising. And this is understandable for we were dealing after all with profound economic reforms and the organization of life on a fundamentally new basis.

The sharpness of the discussion was also conditioned by the fact that there was no sense draft document. One draft document had been submitted by a group under the leadership of Academician Shatalin, the other by the government. I will say right away, however, that the fundamental approaches of these two documents are different. The theoretical and political positions and approaches of the two drafts do not coincide. The position of Academician Shatalin's group amounts to the fact that all the republics are sovereign states and that they are the main, determining subjects of economic union. Furthermore, proceeding from the actual situation, the republics delegate economic authority to the center—the extent and volume determined by the republic supreme soviets—and agree with the need to have a common economic area and develop cooperation of the peoples in the solution of economic problems. And such a position corresponds to the realities; after all, almost all the republics have adopted their declarations on state sovereignty. As you know, the Ukraine has also enacted a law on economic independence. This means that the republics will take the path of statehood. I say "take the path" for in order to speak about full statehood it is necessary to have all the political and economic attributes of this statehood. We do not have this as yet but have taken the path of statehood. This is already an actual fact. This is why the approach of Academician Shatalin's group was supported, without exaggeration, by the representatives of all the republics.

The draft document submitted by the government is based on current positions and is geared to the consolidation of centralization in economic life. And this is the basis for political life also. For this reason this position was not supported. But there is one important detail, and it should be borne in mind for a correct understanding of the situation. If we take the practical aspect, if we take the urgent measures for the fourth quarter of the present year and for 1991, the document prepared by the government contains many serviceable proposals. And when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, evaluating the meeting, spoke of the possibility of a combination of the two documents, he referred precisely to a combination of the practical measures and not the approaches for this is truly impossible: one means states' sovereignty, the other centralization. M.S. Gorbachev twice emphasized that socialist sovereign states already exist, this is a fact. And we should take stock of this and respect them as states. Unless we do there will be no Union treaty and no prospects of our development.

It is this that I emphasize because yesterday Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin said during an interview concerning the meeting that such a combination was impossible in practice. And I say that a combination of the two fundamental approaches contained in the two documents is impossible. And it is this proposition that was emphasized by M.S. Gorbachev. That is, approaches to development prospects are one thing, practical measures to prepare for winter and for the elaboration of a plan and so forth, another.

Discussing the problem of transition to the market, the participants in the meeting emphasized that we cannot and must not proceed from the principle of the unitary state and that the way out should be sought on the paths of the market, on the paths of the formulation of economic regulators, without administrative limitation of enterprise rights.

It was a question of the fact that it is now very important to strive for a stabilization of economic life and prevent a further severance of economic relations between enterprises and interrepublic economic ties.

Such dangerous processes as mass strikes, economic blockades, and interethnic conflicts continue.

All institutions of political power and organs of administration are operating unsatisfactorily. Respect for the organs of power and administration has been undermined. Laws are not respected, and legal nihilism is growing. Crime, in the economic sphere included, is increasing.

A further deterioration in the situation could lead to society failing to survive.

But unfortunately, as the facts attest, certain leaders and some people's deputies at all levels do not understand this or are unwilling to understand it.

The time has come for everyone to ask himself: What should I do to halt the economy's slide toward catastrophe, and is an attempt to shift the blame onto someone else, washing my hands of it when it is not even my neighbor's but my own house which is burning, justified both historically and morally.

The meeting heard a report from Comrade Nishanov concerning the results of consultations concerning the future all-Union treaty.

The Union treaty problem was examined not in a precise, substantive plane but primarily as an organizational problem. No one discussed any specific document. We agreed on how we would work subsequently and how we should structure our work organizationally. And this means that the republics should name their delegations and that in the Union a body to draw up the treaty should be formed. This body would include representatives of all the republics approved at sessions of their supreme soviets and begin work on a common document. There are now 13 drafts, but they are all too general. Work is only just getting under way, although a certain path has already been covered, preparatory groups have been at work and interesting ideas have been expressed in newspapers and journals and on radio and television.

[Correspondent] Did the meeting deal with a specific evaluation of the documents?

[Kravchuk] No one evaluated them, you see, for no document was discussed. Nor do I believe it should be evaluated currently. Any representative council or congress of representatives of all the republics or some other empowered forum may evaluate such a document. Now I repeat, it is a question of the organization of work in order that this commission or committee of representatives of all the republics embark on the preparation of a draft treaty. But this may be done when the republic supreme soviets have approved a concept of the treaty. That will be the basis of the treaty. And the treaty itself will take effect when it has been ratified by all the Union republics at their sessions.

This will be the path of formulation of this important document. For this reason the variety of talk to the effect that some people are going to Moscow and preparing the treaty is groundless. It is merely the preparation for work on the treaty that is under way.

[Correspondent] It is rumored, incidentally, that this is being done behind the back of the Supreme Soviet even.

[Kravchuk] I know that there are such rumors. And I would like to say that nothing is being done behind the back of the Supreme Soviet, and that it is merely an ascertainment of positions that is under way. And we would be imprudent were we to decline such meetings and contacts with the central authorities and colleagues from all the other republics. After all, representatives of all the republics are there. And these contacts, even lobby talk and meetings, I would say, produce much useful food for thought, for analysis, and for a comparison of viewpoints. And just imagine if we in the Ukraine were to retire into our shell, sit it out and wait for someone to do something, and be without information even. It is for this reason that these meetings are of a preparatory nature. I say once again with full responsibility that matters will be decided when a commission has been formed and when this commission has authority. And not only authority but also a concept of the document with which it will work.

True we already have a document by which we should be guided in our assessments and actions. This is the Declaration on State Sovereignty. And no representative of the Ukraine participating in any session or any meeting has the right to retreat from the positions and principles of the declaration.

[Correspondent] Leonid Makarovich, the meeting dealt with the optimum nature of the paths of stabilization of our economy and the transition to the market. Please describe the situation in which our republic finds itself currently at the stage of transition to the market.

[Kravchuk] You know, I spoke twice at this meeting in Moscow and twice analyzed the facts pertaining to our republic, and of course acquired information as to what is happening throughout the country.

I would like to repeat that the situation in the economy is dangerous. I shall cite just one fact here. More than 400 factories and plants have been closed in the country recently. They are being shut down in our republic also. Yes, there are ecologically harmful enterprises that may no longer continue to operate. This is right, but the question arises: Should we not be seeking ways to purchase if not our own then foreign technology in order to prevent a catastrophe, in order that the enterprise continue to operate. For we could close down everything, but what then? Who would provide us with electric power, mineral fertilizer, clothing, and so forth?

Incidentally, representatives of the working class at the meeting proposed that the oblasts that are actively shutting down power stations should possibly pay more per kilowatt of electric power. The principle of a market economy means that no one will give us anything free of charge. The market means primarily an exchange of commodities. They need to be manufactured, and manufactured at high quality in order to withstand competition. And each person must know this simple truth. How are we to understand the position of the politicians who are pushing the situation toward further exacerbation and continuing to speculate on the difficulties. Some deputies on vacation here in the Crimea are meeting with people and calling on them to stage rallies, for disobedience and for noncompliance with decisions and laws. I, as chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, together with all people's deputies, am responsible for what happens in the Ukraine and how we should help people emerge from the economic—and not only economic—crisis. We adopted laws and decisions at the Supreme Soviet session and must now organize their fulfillment: all together on the basis of will and resolve, on the basis of responsibility to the people.

[Correspondent] What then? Is there no one responsible for the realization of these laws?

[Kravchuk] There are persons responsible. There is the government and there are the ministries and departments and economic authorities. But you will agree that it is hardly normal when, instead of helping, some deputies are hindering. We need to emerge from the crisis together since there is no time for personal ambitions now. Economic catastrophe looms. Strikes and civil disobedience are not the way out of the situation. The authorities must have authority and freedom of action. It is another matter when they have all this, but they are incapable of coping with their duties. It is then necessary to approve different authorities.

Something strange is happening currently: The authorities are not being allowed to work, and they are being accused of not performing their functions.

This is a very dangerous situation. Very dangerous. When we are today 5 million tons of coal short, and some people's deputies are going to the coal-mining regions and calling for strikes.... What will happen when winter comes, how will the housing be heated? Do some people think that this coal will fall from the sky? There are no miracles. Everything must be clearly put in its place here: Leaders who fail to perform their duties and adopt decisive measures to organize the production of the necessary products must be dismissed. And their place should be taken by organizers of production who think and work in the modern way.

But the working people who attend mass meetings and listen to those who are deliberately pushing for a crisis, and who are living according to the principle of the worse the better, also should know that they are making things worse primarily for themselves. You may attend mass meetings, you may shut down production, but you should be prepared to live under even worse conditions. For no one has yet found any way toward prosperity other than an increase in production.

[Correspondent] Leonid Makarovich, are you in this case categorically opposed to all mass meetings?

[Kravchuk] Nothing of the sort. I emphasize that a mass meeting could be the only way if there is no other solution.

But with us the majority of mass meetings currently is devoted not to the removal of barriers to the organization of modern production but is of a declarative nature. "Communists out of the soviets!" for example. It is a question not of specific Communists but of all "en masse," as they say. But today this is the way toward confrontation, the way toward destabilization of the situation, and consequently the way toward deadlock.

[Correspondent] Leonid Makarovich, to be candid about your positions concerning the Union treaty, what form would you like to see it take?

[Kravchuk] I have already spoken about this on several occasions. But considering the extraordinary importance of this subject, I would like to once again specify the main positions.

I state the propositions in lapidary fashion because each one requires some explanation, and this would then turn into a lecture. I will dwell primarily on the principles of the composition of the union treaty and its content.

A most important principle of the composition of the treaty and the Union should be the fact that this is not a unitary state but a Union of free, independent, sovereign socialist republic-states. We should prepare such a document with regard for the economic, political, national-state, and legal situations that have taken shape in our country today. And we should take into consideration here:

the objective processes of the profound democratization of the national-state arrangement of the republics and the aspiration of the peoples to economic and political sovereignty;

the equality and equal rights of all members of the Union;

that the Union enjoys merely the authority delegated to it by the republics;

the full and unlimited sovereignty of the republics and subjects of this Union, for they are a part of the Union as independent sovereign states;

the process of formation of the Union moves upward, not downward.

It is important to emphasize the following point. If a republic delegates authority, this by no means limits its sovereignty. Delegation is a form of realization of a republic's sovereign rights by the Union bodies formed by the republics themselves. And they will be formed on two principles. The first is the principle of representation, when the republics delegate their representatives to the Union bodies, and the Finance Ministry for example could be a board consisting of representatives of the Union republic finance ministries.

The second principle is the federal principle since a Council of the Federation has now been formed.

Further, interpretation of the Union treaty may only be specific and precise within the limits of its authority. No expanded interpretation is permitted.

It is important to emphasize such a position as the primacy of the republics' rights in relation to the Union, primacy of all rights in both the economic and political spheres. All is determined by the republics for here is the basis of life, here the ownership of everything on earth whether it be income or profits. Everything is decided and authority is delegated in the republics, and certain resources are allocated for the delegated authority.

One further point. One further arguable issue is whether a Union constitution is needed given this approach? Could its role not be performed by the Union treaty? And only the Union republics adopt constitutions?

As you will recall, incidentally, the first Union Constitution in 1924 consisted of two documents: the Declaration on the Formation of the USSR and the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR. It was the later constitutions that departed from this Leninist principle.

[Correspondent] And what opinion has been reached?

[Kravchuk] No opinion has been reached as yet. There was no discussion. I am expressing my positions.

And a few final points. It is extraordinarily important in the treaty to precisely delineate the authority pertaining to the Union and the authority pertaining jointly to the Union and the republics. It is not even necessary to specify the rest. Some people are disposed to specifying the exclusive authority of the republics. But to what end? If a republic transfers four or five powers, all the rest are reserved to it. And there is no need to emphasize this. If this is emphasized, this very fact would mean a limitation of the republics' rights (political and economic) and a suggestion that some things still need to be specified. The republic reserves to itself everything and transfers only certain powers. And I believe that it is extremely important to speak precisely in the Union treaty about legal guarantees not only of the input of authority but of the recall of authority. It is essential to speak of guarantees of secession from the Union altogether and the mechanism of secession. V.I. Lenin wrote that each republic has the right to self-determination, up to and including secession from the Union. But there has been no mechanism of secession. There must be.

This is important work. It is geared to the long term, and we need to embark on it now since we cannot look for the success of perestroyka without it, although this does not mean that we will be able to adopt the treaty tomorrow. We need to extricate the economy from crisis, put life in order, and consolidate all the healthy forces. We need to have a sense of responsibility, each deputy included, for the fate of the republic and to remember that each step and each word should today be carefully considered considering the danger that looms over us and considering that we could tomorrow plunge into an economic abyss. And if this happens everyone will plunge, regardless of rank and regardless of the political party to which he attributes himself. And then it will be history that will be looking for the guilty parties.

We have now embarked on the path of sovereignty, on the path of independence. This is a path that has been conquered in struggle. We specified at the Supreme Soviet session that no one would leave this path. And no leader of the Supreme Soviet is engaging in any political speculation behind the deputies' backs. Although I know that in the Crimea some people have begun to speculate in connection with the problem of the Crimean Tatars, the time is coming when I will name these people who are coming to the Crimea and proposing to the Tatars: "You support us and help us shake up the situation in the Crimea, and when we take power in the Ukraine we will give you Tatar Republic status." But this is speculation, political bargaining, and even flouting the principles of the declaration that deputies adopted with tears in their eyes. I am for a scrupulous and honest policy, without mercenary haggling for the sake of personal ambitions and for the sake of winning power.

The people have been brought to the point of despair, and those who are today making the loudest speeches at mass meetings have had a hand in this.

So is it not time to call a halt and help these people? The more so because we here in the Ukraine have the opportunities for this. We have resources, we have people, we have science and technology. People understand that shaking up the situation any further is dangerous. They are saying: Comrades, stop. Let us work normally and give us all that we need for this. But some political leaders are not hearing these appeals from people.

For this reason I would like to conclude my interview as follows—and I am grateful that you came during my vacation and I understand that the reason for the interview was my direct participation in the meeting. These are critical and dynamic times, and everyone must understand this.

Today we have to emerge from a state of crisis and we, ourselves, have to emerge. No one will help us here. We are the same as everyone else: two arms, two legs, and a head. We ourselves can overcome the crisis and become a civilized Ukrainian state with our own culture and our own economy and hereby earn respect for ourselves as a great power. We can and we must. And I would like to say once again that the representatives of authority, including people's deputies of all levels, who do not take this into consideration and who are pushing for confrontation, do not want this and are putting their interests and their ambitions above the interests of the people and the interests of the Ukraine.

If someone is specifically to blame for something or other, I wish to say once again: This person may not occupy the position he occupies. But generalizing the situation and pushing toward the brink beyond which misfortune and economic catastrophe begin is irresponsibility.

The people no longer want a sensation, the people are listening to those who are presenting specific propositions; the people want action, the people want to work and want to be helped. And it is we who should be doing this if we are thinking about their fate, and we should help organize a life for people without shortages and lines and without profiteering, crime, and the shadow economy. It is for this that people elected the deputies and entrusted them with forming the executive and judicial authorities.

[Correspondent] Thank you for this interview, and permit me one question of a personal nature. How are you spending your vacation?

[Kravchuk] You know, I came on vacation on 20 August. But I have been on the road for 5 days. This vacation has been useful for me in that I have had an opportunity to concentrate on thinking over the problems that have to be tackled. Doing this in Kiev is difficult. In order to check out my positions, I made a trip to Sevastopol and met with the city's people's deputies. An interesting meeting lasting nearly 3 hours was held.

[Correspondent] And have you been bathing in the sea?

[Kravchuk] Of course. The Crimean sun and the waters of the Black Sea help me relax, analyze, and prepare myself for the next session.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church Seeks Broader Autonomy

LD2210174190 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church has decided to convene an archbishops' assembly later this week to discuss broader autonomy for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and other issues, church officials announced in Moscow today.

All the church's 97 bishops, archbishops and metropolitans were invited to attend the October 25-27 meeting, to be chaired by Patriarch Alexey II of Moscow and all Russia.

The assembly will take place in his official residence in the Soviet capital's Danilov monastery.

In keeping with the statute on the administration of the Russian Orthodox Church, such meetings are called as necessary to decide on essential religious affairs, but no less frequently than once in two years.

The assembly has full legislative, executive, and judicial powers in-between local council meetings, which are convened at least once in five years.

This week's assembly is expected to consider a request from the Bishopry of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for greater self-government. The Ukrainian church's synod is led by Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, patriarchal exarch to the Ukraine.

The assembly is also expected to adopt a standard statute for the Moscow patriarchate's parishes in the Soviet Union, in addition to discussing issues stemming from the enactment of new legislation on freedom of conscience and other current religious matters, including relations with churches abroad.

Caucasus

Georgian Legislative Election Preparations Viewed

PM2310105690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Besik Urigashvili under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Georgia Faces Elections"]

[Text] Tbilisi—The first multiparty elections to the republic legislature take place 28 October. Fourteen parties, party blocs, and organizations have been energetically involved in election activities.

Representatives of parties and organizations have been allocated two hours of airtime daily on Georgian television in order to acquaint electors with their programs. The republic press is also devoting much attention to the forthcoming elections.

Despite the differences in election programs, they are united in one thing—Georgia's achievement of political and economic independence. Only the methods of achieving this goal are interpreted differently. The only exception is perhaps the "Stalin" political organization. The thesis of the USSR's inviolable unity and the solidarity of the whole world's proletariat serves as the basis of its election program. Incidentally, the Central Electoral Commission at first refused to register this organization, claiming that its activities are contrary to the Law on Elections, but the republic Supreme Court overruled this decision.

Several Tbilisi University students and lecturers declared a hunger strike to protest the participation in the elections of organizations that are, in their opinion, unlawfully registered. They are primarily referring to the "Stalin" organization and the Agrarian Union.

According to a poll by sociologists, the Communist Party and the "Roundtable-Free Georgia" bloc of parties currently enjoy the greatest support among electors.

In the political situation in Georgia today the following factor must be taken into consideration: Several radical parties have completely ignored the Supreme Soviet elections and have decided to remain outside parliament. Instead they have held elections to a National Congress which, on the assurance of these parties' leaders, does not aspire to the role of a parallel power but is merely a coordinating body for the national liberation movement. The results of these elections are not yet known. If less than 51 percent of electors take part in them, the congress will not be elected.

A complex situation has developed in the Abkhaz ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. It has been revealed that the "Aydgylara" Abkhaz People's Front and the "Adamon Nykhas" South Ossetian political organization have called on the inhabitants of these regions to boycott the forthcoming elections.

And the latest piece of information that has come from the Central Electoral Commission. The commission has barred the Agrarian Union from participating in the elections for violating the provisions of the Law on Elections. The "Stalin" organization also committed violations in the formulation of its party list. In connection with this a special group has been formed which has been charged with investigating the matter.

Communist Party Leads in Poll

PM2310095890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Georgia on Election Eve: Communists Enjoy Biggest Support"]

[Text] According to the results of a poll conducted by the Georgian Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Center, the Communist Party enjoys the greatest support on the eve of the elections to the republic Supreme Soviet and local organs of power which will take place 28 October. Thirty-two percent of respondents expressed support for the Communists. The radical opposition—the bloc of the "Roundtable-Free Georgia" party headed by Eviad Gamsakhurdiya—is supported by 21.5 percent of respondents, and the liberal-democratic organization—the Rustaveli Society—by 15.3 percent. As your INTERFAX correspondent noted, the "Accord-Peace-Revival" bloc of parties, headed by USSR People's Deputy Valerian Advadze, obtained the unexpectedly high rating of 8.9 percent. The popularity of the Georgian People's Front has considerably declined, standing at only 8.6 percent of the votes. Four percent of those polled express a liking for the "Stalin" society.

Georgian National Congress Election Reported

LD2210214490 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Gvritishviliy]

[Text] Tbilisi October 22 TASS—The results of the elections to the Georgian National Congress were announced here today with a three-week delay. They were held on September 30-October 1 at the initiative of several Georgian opposition parties.

The National Congress was conceived as a catalyst of the National Liberation Movement behind the idea of restoring Georgia's state independence and an instrument of control over the operation of state bodies.

According to the final count, the victory was won by the National Independence Party which gained 71 seats out of the total of 200.

The bloc of the National Democratic Party and the Democratic Party placed second with 65 seats. The second runner-up was the bloc of Democratic Georgia with 37 seats.

Other seats were won by smaller parties, including the democratic faction of the Georgian Communist Party, which managed to win only 11 seats.

A statement by the congress electoral commission said that 50.88 per cent of the Georgain electorate participated in the elections to the congress, which makes the results of the poll valid.

At the same time the document explains the lengthy delay with ballot-counting by "the lack of appropriate equipment."

According to local analysts, although the elections to the congress have become an important political event in the republic, their results do not reflect the balance of forces in Georgia.

The explanation is that the elections were boycotted by the Georgian Communist Party and the bloc of opposition parties called "roundtable," which, according to the latst public poll, are most popular in the republic.

Stonethrowers Attack Convoy in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2210180290 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Stepanakert October 22 TASS—A convoy of vehicles driving in Azerbaijan's disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh was stoned by locals today. One assailant was killed and three others were injured when they were repulsed by Interior Ministry troops.

The convoy, travelling on the Kelbadzhar-Mir-Bashir route, came under attack in the village of Leninavan, Mardakert District. Two buses and two trucks were damaged.

Ten passengers, including two women were injured and had to be taken to hospital. The attackers were driven away by fire from Interior Ministry troops.

In an unrelated development, police uncovered a large cache of arms and ammunition in the village of Khachmach, Nagorno-Karabakh's Askeran District.

The haul included a grenade-launcher, mortars, grenades, machine- gun and submachine-gun ammunition, and explosives.

According to an early lead, the weapons were brought to the village by helicopter by six militants on October 16. An investigation is under way.

Nakhichevan Power Cut Off for Fourth Time

PM2310090490 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Captain Third Rank B. Yermolin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Electricity Supply Switched Off"]

[Text] Nakhichevan—On Thursday 18 October at 1005 hours the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet

Socialist Republic] was deprived of its light. For 25 minutes the republic was paralyzed as regards power.

"This is the fourth such case in the past two months," I. Dzhafarov, chief engineer at the Nakhichevan power supply systems enterprise, told me, "that the Armenian Administration for Power Services has severed the supply from the electric power transmission line that connects us with the integrated power system—and without any explanations. Unfortunately the sole power line that supplies the republic's electricity comes to us through Armenia. And as I already said, it is the fourth time that they are letting us know that they can 'cut off the oxygen' at will. The damage from such tyranny is enormous. As a result of the present stoppage, production units at the glass container plant and the galvanizing section at the electrical equipment plant have stopped, the communal water main has been put out of operation, the railroad has stopped.... There is no point in listing these things, as I think that every educated person understands the material losses that even a short-term disconnection in such a large region as our republic causes. The total damage from all four disconnections comes to over 2 million rubles.

International Business Congress Held in Azerbaijan

LD2210165590 Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondents Namik Azizov and Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku October 22 TASS—The first international business congress, which ended here today, has opened up broad prospects for Azerbaijan's external economic relations.

It was attended by 750 heads and top experts of approximately 400 foreign firms from 44 countries. "Soviet Azerbaijan has never hosted such a large number of businessmen before," Azerbaijan Premier Gasan Gasanov told a press conference here.

The initial expectations of the congress sponsors were surpassed: Some 40 large contracts were concluded and 21 agreements on joint ventures were signed. In accordance with these agreements, the volume of the republic's export and import operations were fixed at 500 million roubles. Formerly such a sum could not be achieved even in five years. The congress showed that Azerbaijanian businessmen are professionally competent.

When the government opened the Azerbaijanian economy to foreign businessmen, it did not intend to sell out the republic's natural resources for the sake of immediate results. This is borne out by the fact that the "British Petroleum" was unable to sign right away a long-term, agreement on the joint development of Caspian offshore oil deposits. Realising that U.S., Norwegian, South Korean, Venezuelan and other companies are interested in Azerbaijanian petroleum, it was decided to organise an international tender contest. This will allow Azerbaijan to make profitable use of its national wealth and will guarantee the optimal development of the republic's principal branch of economy.

"We do not fear competition and are sure of victory," British Petroleum top official Rondow Filbert stressed. "As distinct from many firms, which fear to invest in the Soviet economy, we are plunging headlong into it without much ado," he told TASS. "I believe we will not lose anything. As far as I know, the Azerbaijanian parliament is now discussing an important bill to protect foreign invetments on the republic's territory. I think this is the best guarantee."

It was noted, when the results of the congress were summed up, that Azerbaijan's decision to pursue an independent foreign economic policy would not affect inter-republican relations. The republic will meet fully its domestic contractual commitments, exrcising at the same time its political, economic and legal right to dispose of its national wealth as it sees fit.

Central Asia

Kirghiz Soviet Discusses Osh Oblast Incidents

LD2210172590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent V. Fedorov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At the beginning of the [Kirghiz Supreme Soviet] session, deputies honored the memory of those killed during the inter-ethnic conflict in Osh Oblast. Information from a group of deputies of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on the investigation into the circumstances connected with those events is included on the agenda of the session. It should be noted that assessments of the tragedy have been made in the party bodies and in the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, but the Kighiz Parliament has not yet said its word.

This question is number 10 on the agenda, and a total of 12 questions have been presented at the session, including the question of the presidency, the draft declaration of state sovereignty of Kirghiz SSR, the government program for the stabilization of the republic's national economy, and transition to the market economy.

Discussion in the local press has shown that here there are different, sometimes diametrically opposed opinions. The fact is since the first session—which disappointed many deputies by its conservative spirit—social movements have been activated in the republic. The Interregional Deputies' Group for Democratic Renewal and Civic Agreement in Kirghizia has been set up. From its platform, a group of Osh deputies have spoken and a number of drafts have been published by the Kirgistan Democratic Movement.

Kirghizian Parliament Begins Extraordinary Session

LD2210113190 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze October 22 TASS—An extraordinary session of Kirghizian parliament opened in the republican capital today.

Observers expect heated discussion on the government plan for stabilising the economy and introducing market relations, the declaration of state sovereignty, the law on citizenship and the creation of the post of republican president.

Unanimity among Kirghizian people's deputies is a thing of the distant past. A month before the session, the local press published a statement by the deputy group "For democratic renewal, for civil peace in Kirghizia". The statement was signed by nearly 50 per cent of all deputies. They call for more radical measures to dismantle the command-and-bureaucratic system.

The democratic movement "Kyrgyzstan" has published its own plan to create a sovereign national "Republic of Kirghizia".

Frunze City Soviet Decides To Hold 7 Nov Parade

PM2310092690 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 p 1

[Report reprinted from SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA under general heading "Did You Hear? Did You Read?"]

[Text] The 73d Anniversary of October will be marked in Frunze by a military parade and a demonstration by the working people. That is the decision of the city soviet. The majority of secretaries of raykoms [rayon party committees] and enterprise party committees came out in favor of the holiday having a mass character and becoming a day of consolidation and unity of the working people, a day of cultured rest.

Kirghiz Communist Party Plenum Examines Economy

LD2110044890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1156 GMT 20 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze, 20 Oct (TASS)—The plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, which took place here today, examined the tasks of Communists of the Republic in connection with the transition to market relations.

Despite the fact that new social formations have come onto the political scene recently, the Communist Party of Kirghizia, with over 150,000 members, remains the most influential force in the Republic. There is more democratism in its work and less red tape, and that—Communists themselves think—has led to a growth in party ranks. Since the beginning of this year, 3,043 people have joined the party: considerably more than have left its ranks.

The plenum spoke in favor of the privatization of some enterprises. Tough measures were proposed for reducing the state budget deficit: suspending the construction of a series of installations, revoking investments in programs yielding no more than a remote effect, and halting subsidies to loss-making enterprises. It was decided to step up the creation of share-holding societies. Since the beginning of the year, the Republic's working people have acquired shares to the tune of around 8 million rubles in their own enterprises.

The plenum adopted a decision aimed at enhancing the activity of Communists in the work to introduce market relations into the Republic's economy.

Osh Deputies Oppose Creating Kirghiz Presidency

PM2210155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90, p 1

[Report by correspondent Aleksandr Ryabushkin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Osh Oblast Deputies' Platform"]

[Text] Frunze—The "Platform of the Republic People's Deputies From Osh Oblast" has been published in Kirghizia.

In it the republic deputies from Osh Oblast particularly oppose those who develop and propagandize ideas and programs of a nationalist bent. The tragic events in Osh Oblast have shown how destructive such ideas and demands are in the absence of proper political awareness and democratic traditions here.

The parliamentarians come out against the introduction of the institution of presidency in Kirghizia, arguing that the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet can vest extra powers in its chairman.

It has been resolved to examine and assess the tragic events in Osh Oblast at the Supreme Soviet session which starts 22 October. The deputies appeal to their parliamentary colleagues not to allow discussion of this question to be used by destructive forces to foment passions over the tragedy. The deputies hope that the Supreme Soviet will prevent political exploitation of the tragic events by certain interested forces for their own narrow group objectives.

Kazakhstan To Have Public Ecological Newspaper

LD2210215190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0000 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Summary] As from January 1991, a public ecological newspaper called TABIGAT SAKSHISIY [NATURE GUARD] and ECOCOURIER will publish in Kazakhstan. It will be published by the Kazakh soviet socialist republic State Committee for Nature Protection.